FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-95-092
Friday
12 May 1995

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Daily Report
Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-95-092 *12 May 1995*

CONTENTS

NOTICE: An * indicates material that may not be disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Islamic Affairs

Al-Azhar Imam Comments on Jerusalem Visit, Peace *[AL-'ARABI 8 May]* 1

Palestinian Affairs

Envoy Discusses Security Council Debate, U.S. Stance *[Cairo Radio]* 3
Qaddumi Urges U.S. To Prevent Israeli Land Move *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 11 May]* 4
'Arafat Reiterates Jerusalem Stand to Patriarch *[Jericho VOP]* 4
U.S. Embassy Proposal Called 'Dangerous Terrorism' *[London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI 10 May]* 4
'Tangible Progress' Seen in Israeli Secret Talks *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 10 May]* 5
Palestinian Grouping Head Interviewed *[London FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH Apr]* 6

ARAB AFRICA

Algeria

Former Minister: State Must Use 'Legal Violence' *[Algiers Radio]* 11
Government Approves Draft Order on Privatization *[Algiers Radio]* 13

Egypt

Delegate: Country 'Does Not Support' NPT Extension *[MENA]* 14
Daily Urges UN Resolution on Land Expropriation *[MENA]* 15
Commentary Says Peace Process at 'Critical Juncture' *[Cairo Radio]* 16
Foreign Financing of 'Extremist Elements' Exposed *[London AL-MAJALLAH 13 May]* 16
National Conference To Discuss Nuclear Dangers *[AL-AHRAM AL-DUWALI 13 Feb]* 17

ARABIAN PENINSULA

Gulf Affairs

Alleged Extremist Plans To Destabilize Gulf *[Paris AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI 10 Feb]* 24

Kuwait

*Continuation of Sanctions Against Iraq Urged *[London AL-HAWADITH 24 Feb]* 27

Oman

*Sultan Qabus Promotes Private Sector Economics *[Paris AL-WATAN AL'ARABI 10 Feb]* 29

IRAQ

Delegate: NPT Extension Fails To Dispel 'Fears' *[INA]* 31
Reportage on Foreign Minister's Meetings at UN 31
Greets NAM's UN Envoys *[INA]* 31
Meets Argentine UN Envoy *[INA]* 31
Meets Chinese Deputy UN Representative *[INA]* 31
Further on Meetings With Envoys *[INA]* 31
'Regime' Said To Have Executed 35 Army Officers *[Voice of the People of Kurdistan]* 32
Attack on Government Security Forces Reported *[Voice of Iraqi Islamic Revolution]* 32

ISRAEL

Rabin Defends Land Expropriations in Jerusalem *[MA'ARIV 12 May]* 33
Rabin Denies U.S. Made Offers on Syria Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 33
Rabin: Iranian Threat Persists; U.S. Efforts Fail *[MA'ARIV 12 May]* 33
Peres: 'No Reason Whatsoever' To Help Iran *[Jerusalem Radio]* 34
Rabin Issues Statement Rejecting Amnesty Report *[Israel Information Service]* 34
Shohat on Need for Ties With Palestinian Economy *[Jerusalem Radio]* 35
PA Phones Not Disconnected After Intervention *[Jerusalem Radio]* 35

JORDAN

Leading Officials Comment on Indefinite NPT Extension 36
Foreign Minister Welcomes Decision *[Amman TV]* 36
Delegate Urges Israeli Inclusion *[Amman Radio]* 36

LEBANON

Radio Reports Kidnap of 'Citizen' in South *[VOL]* 37
Released After Questioning *[Jerusalem Radio]* 37
IDF Soldier Killed by Friendly Fire in South *[Jerusalem Radio]* 37
Hizballah Welcomes 'Foreign Visitors' in Ba'labakk *[AL-NAHAR 4 May]* 37

SYRIA

Statement: Country 'Cannot Agree' to NPT Extension *[Damascus Radio]* 38
Radio Urges Removal of Israeli Nuclear Weapons *[Damascus Radio]* 38
U.S. Senate Bill on Jerusalem Called 'Saddening' *[Damascus Radio]* 39
Jordanian Request To Name New Envoy Rejected *[London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI 9 May]* 40

SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan

Rabbani Delivers Speech Marking 'Id al-Adha *[Kabul Radio]* 41
*Background on Taleban, Zones of Influence Viewed *[Paris LE MONDE 20 Feb]* 42

India

Further Reportage, Commentary on Clashes in Kashmir 43
Army: 'No Civilian Casualty' *[Delhi Radio]* 43
Islamabad Condemns Army 'Siege' *[Islamabad Radio]* 44
Pakistan Warned on 'Interference' *[Delhi Radio]* 44
Commentary Blames Pakistan *[Delhi International]* 44
Editorial Laments 'Dastardly Action' *[THE PIONEER 11 May]* 45
Minister Denies Sri Lanka Seeking Military Aid *[Delhi Radio]* 46

Iran

Further on Sanctions, Strained U.S. Relations 46
Libya's Al-Qadhdhafi Pledges Support *[IRNA]* 46
Citizens Boycott U.S. Products *[IRNA]* 46
Rally Condemns 'U.S. Plots' *[IRNA]* 47
Daily Assails 'Hostile' U.S. Policy *[JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI 1 May]* 47
Daily: Country Will 'Resist' Pressure *[TEHRAN TIMES 26 Apr]* 48

Views on Russian Relations, Nuclear Cooperation 49
Envoy on 'Commitment,' Regional Issues *[TEHRAN TIMES 9 May]* 49
Interview With Atomic Energy Head *[Tehran Radio]* 50
Russia Said Committed to Cooperation *[IRNA]* 51
Daily Views U.S.-Russian 'Rift' *[IRNA]* 52
NPT Official Views Communique, U.S. Pressure *[Tehran Radio]* 52
Hajj Supervisor Meets Hezbollah Members *[Tehran Radio]* 53
Article Views Self-Administration of Hospitals *[SALAM 12 Mar]* 53

Pakistan

Bhutto Condemns 'Barbaric' Indian Act in Kashmir *[Islamabad Radio]* 54
Leghari Interviewed on Kashmir, Regional Issues *[INDIA TODAY 15 May]* 55

Sri Lanka

President: Ready To Confront Any Situation *[Colombo International]* 58
Military Launches Attack; Pursues 'Terrorists' *[Colombo International]* 58

Islamic Affairs

Al-Azhar Imam Comments on Jerusalem Visit, Peace

NC1105110595 Cairo AL-'ARABI in Arabic
8 May 95 p 5

[Interview with Shaykh Jad-al-Haqq 'Ali Jad-al-Haqq, the grand imam of al-Azhar, by 'Adil al-Sanhuri; place and date not given]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Al-Sanhuri] Your Eminence the Grand Imam: We have recently heard people saying that visiting the al-Aqsa Mosque and holy Jerusalem is an obligation. Are Muslims obliged to do this, particularly since the al-Aqsa Mosque and Jerusalem are held captive by the Jews?

[Jad-al-Haqq] The term obligation [wajib] in Islamic jurisprudence means a compulsory duty demanded by the legislator. Its mandate is confirmed by a presumptive [zanni], evidence with suspicion. He who follows it is rewarded and he who abandons it without excuse is punished. He who denies it is not deemed an infidel, but a sinner. Visiting al-Aqsa Mosque and holy Jerusalem does not come under the term duty. It is one of the acts God has left up to people to perform or leave. He who prays there receives double reward but he who does not is not punished, according to the prophet's saying that prohibits Muslims from travelling to any mosque for prayers except the prophet's mosque in Medina, the Mecca Mosque, and the al-Aqsa Mosque. It is clear from the saying that travelling to mosques for prayer is prohibited except for the Mecca Mosque, the prophet's Mosque in Medina, and the al-Aqsa Mosque in holy Jerusalem in Palestine, which is desirable. The reward for performing prayers in each varies, as confirmed by the prophet's documented sayings. If so, visiting, praying in, and travelling to the al-Aqsa Mosque is desirable [mustahabb] and the reward for praying there is doubled, although the degree of the reward is disputed. Accordingly, visiting the al-Aqsa Mosque is not an obligation.

But in view of the conditions in Palestine generally and Jerusalem in particular, in terms of Israel's occupation of this land, which makes al-Aqsa Mosque almost a captive, visits to it by people other than those who live there would be tantamount to an act of acknowledgement by the visitors that they accept the issue and the Israelis' occupation of Jerusalem and all Palestine. This is unacceptable for Muslims, who have not acknowledged the legitimacy of Israel's usurping of this land, including the entire al-Aqsa Mosque, which is blessed by God. Thus it would be more worthwhile for Muslims, other than those living in Palestine and Jerusalem, not to travel to Jerusalem for purposes other than defending and protecting the mosque, until the city is cleansed of the profanity of the usurpers and returns to its Arab owners so that it can be peaceful and secure and God's name and prayers can be upheld in peace and security. Muslims everywhere must act to liberate Jerusalem and its al-Aqsa Mosque, where the prophet went on his night journey and from which he ascended to the highest heavens, as confirmed by the first verse of the chapter, al-Isra'.

It is more worthwhile for the Islamic nation to act to liberate it, elevate it, and insist on not entering all Jerusalem until it is cleansed of the profanity of usurpers. "But honor belongs to God and his apostle, and to the believers." [Koranic verse]

[Al-Sanhuri] There is a question that is preoccupying our minds these days, after reports about the establishment of peace with the enemy. Is it possible to establish a permanent peace with those who have usurped the lands of Muslims and displaced their children? Does this go along with the shari'ah and the Prophet's traditions?

[Jad-al-Haqq] Islam is and has always been the religion of security, peace, tranquility, purity, cordiality, and brotherhood. It is not a religion of war, feuds, or grudges. It did not use the sword to control or impose authority. Its wars were a means to secure its call, which according to this age's logic are defensive wars. The holy Koran ordered the believers not to fight if there was no need for it. God tells us in His book: "Therefore, if they withdraw from you but fight you not, and (instead) send you (guarantees of) peace, then God hath opened no way for you (to war against them)." Also: "But if the enemy incline towards peace, do thou (also) incline towards peace, and trust in God, for He is the one that heareth and knoweth (all things). Should they intend to deceive thee, verily God sufficeth thee." [Koranic verses] [passage omitted]

Muslim jurisprudents, with their different schools of thought, have dedicated chapters in their books to clarify the regulations for truce and reconciliation with non-Muslims. They all agreed that the head of the Muslim state should hold a truce, reconcile with his non-Muslim fighters, and stop the war with them so long as this is in the interest of the Muslims.

When we read the interpretations by our ulemas of the verses of the Koran and traditions of the Prophet, God's peace and blessings be upon him, on the issues of war and reconciliation, and when we read what the jurisprudents had to say in this regard, we see that according to the shari'ah, they deemed it necessary to have the following rules for establishing treaties with non-Muslims:

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

First, the Prophet said: "What is wrong with these men placing conditions that are not stipulated in God's book? If a condition is set that is not in God's book, then it is an invalid condition. God's condition is fairer and more righteous." This means that the person charged with authority who enters into an agreement with non-Muslims must not accept any conditions that may explicitly or implicitly contradict the texts of the holy Koran. The purpose of this is to preserve the general character of the shari'ah and the dignity of Islam and the Muslims. The Almighty said: "But honor belongs to God and His apostle, and to the believers." [Koranic verse]

An example of these invalid conditions is when the treaty contains an alliance with non-Muslims against Muslims, or when it stipulates abstention from rescuing Muslims when their land and property are under attack.

Second, conditions in treaties should be clear and obvious, along the lines of the reconciliation treaties the Prophet, God's peace and blessings be upon him, signed. They were very specific on the rights and mutual commitments among the parties to the treaty so that there could be no scope for cheating, treachery, and usurpation of rights.

Third, a treaty should be signed within the scope of equality between the two sides. The person charged with authority should not sign a treaty or reconcile with the other party through threats because the principle of Islam is mutual agreement over all contracts and peace between Muslims and non-Muslims is stipulated by Islam. One of the general principles stipulated by the shari'ah in treating the people of the book [Christians and Jews] is to leave them alone and not to attack them so long as they are peaceful. In fact, there should be equality between them and the Muslims with regard to rights and public duties. The shari'ah legalized comforting them and relieving the distressed among them. The shari'ah approved mixing with them and permitted Muslims to marry non-Muslim women. It prohibited killing them, except in reaction to an aggression. The Almighty said: "As long as these stand true to you, stand ye true to them, for God doth love the righteous." [Koranic verse] One of the edicts of Islam was to be honest to the conditions of these treaties so long as they are agreed upon, they fall within its scope and not outside its regulations, the other party adheres to them, and circumstances for signing them are not changed. The holy Koran says: "(But the treaties) are not dissolved with those pagans with whom ye have entered into alliance and who have not subsequently failed you in aught, nor aided anyone against you. So fulfill your engagements with them to the end of their term." [Koranic verse] On expecting treason from the treaty, the Koran calls for alertness and caution: "If thou fearest treachery from any group, throw back (their covenant) to them, (so as to be) on equal terms. For God loveth not the treacherous." [Koranic verse]

This is the ruling of Islam on establishing treaties and reconciliation and even in alliances with non-Muslims. Islam sanctions those treaties that guarantee stable peace and preserve rights and at the same time bans betraying a promise and orders loyalty to it.

[Al-Sanhuri] The issue of "those in charge of the authority" of the Muslims needs explanation, particularly regarding controversial views stated occasionally by jurisprudents on issues such as that of Jerusalem.

[Jad-al-Haqq] Those in charge of authority are all those who are in charge of any affair involving the Muslims in general, beginning with the head of state down to the lowest rank in the state, including the ulema, because they are in charge of memorizing and upholding the shar'iah and explaining what is allowed and what is prohibited. They also include those with insight and views and who are known among the nation to be fully qualified in their area of expertise and fully aware of the nation's interests. The Muslims must accept what those in charge of authority agree on regarding an issue under discussion or must accept it according to cogent evidence. There is no doubt that the affairs of the nation are varied and diverse and that God Almighty distributes jurisdiction to individuals according to the nation's varied and diverse affairs. Every area of life has its own men with knowledge, such as the Judiciary, Treasury, economy, politics, social aspects, what is allowed and what is prohibited, and so on and so forth. In every one of these areas there are men known for their mature and sober views and long experience. These men can be considered to be in charge of authority in an area in which they excel. The people must obey these men in charge. Evidence in the prophet's tradition and in the Koran stipulates obedience to these men. Disobedience is prohibited; this obedience is not absolute, but must be harmonious with the shari'ah. The holy Koran says: "O ye who believe! obey God, and obey the Apostle, and those charged with authority among you." [Koranic verse] [passage omitted]

[Al-Sanhuri] What is the duty of those people charged with authority toward the nation?

[Jad-al-Haqq] They must act in the general interest of Muslims, each in his field of knowledge and authority and according to the power vested in him. Hence the shari'ah rule that says: "Behavior toward the people is contingent on the general interest." The details are as follows:

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

1. To memorize and uphold religion according to its established rules and on what the nation's predecessors concurred. Should someone deviate, the men in charge will explain what is right.

2. To determine who is right and who is wrong between parties to a dispute and to establish justice so that the aggressor cannot transgress and the oppressed is not undermined.

3. To protect the State and defend the assembly of ulema so that the people can lead their own life and travel peacefully.

4. To exact the shari'ah's punishment against transgressors so that God's taboos will not be violated and peoples' rights are safeguarded.

5. To fortify borders with sufficient deterrent force so that the enemies might not break through and take over Muslim land and violate taboos or shed Muslim blood.

6. To struggle against anyone who resists Islam after preaching so that he will either convert to Islam or pay such tribute as non- Muslims pay.

7. To fight oppressors, warriors, and highwaymen and to sign agreements and the like in the interest of the nation and to consult with those who have sober views. Consultation is considered to be one of the most important rules for those in charge of the authority of Muslim affairs. The holy Koran's call is clear: "Were thou severe or harsh-hearted, they would have broken away from about thee: So pass over (their faults), and ask for (God's) forgiveness for them; and consult them in affairs (of moment). "Those who hearken to their Lord, and establish regular prayer; who (conduct) their affairs by mutual consultation; who spend out of what we bestow on them for sustenance." [Koranic verse]

Palestinian Affairs

Envoy Discusses Security Council Debate, U.S. Stance

NC1205070795 Cairo Voice of the Arabs in Arabic 0510 GMT 12 May 95

[Telephone interview with Nasir al-Qudwah, Palestinian representative at the United Nations, in New York, by Shihatah Abu-al-Majd, in Cairo, from the "Dialogue From Afar" program; date not given—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Abu-al-Majd] Good morning, Ambassador, and welcome to the Voice of the Arabs.

[Al-Qudwah] Good morning to you and to the dear listeners.

[Abu-al-Majd] The UN Security Council was due to meet yesterday to discuss Israeli measures against Jerusalem, its people, the holy places, and the Arab land. But the meeting was postponed until today. Why?

[Al-Qudwah] We requested the postponement because we did not want to give the impression that the Security Council session is devoted only to general discussion. We wanted to make it clear to everybody that the main purpose is to examine and adopt a draft resolution. So we wanted two things to go hand in hand: a discussion and a study of a draft resolution. This is why we asked for a postponement. We held some necessary contacts to secure appropriate support for the draft resolution, which was offered at first as an Arab draft.

[Abu-al-Majd] Have you actually secured such support, specifically, from the United States?

[Al-Qudwah] Since the beginning the United States has adopted an extremely negative stance. You remember that it rejected even convening a Security Council session. But the clear Arab position, which is supported by the Islamic and Nonaligned countries, prompted the Security Council to act in the right way in accordance with the regulations and measures. The session was arranged in a legal and regular manner and we secured much support for the draft resolution. The United States continues to resist the principle of the Security Council passing any resolution, but we continue with our attempts and hope to succeed. [passage omitted]

[Abu-al-Majd] Which permanent Security Council member states support the draft resolution? We now know the position of the United States.

[Al-Qudwah] The situation in the Security Council is generally positive and this applies to the positions of the permanent members, except for the United States, as you said. Pressure on the United States is growing and we will see how things develop. [passage omitted]

[Abu-al-Majd] Do you expect a change in the U.S. position in the next few hours? Are you still in touch with the United States at the Security Council?

[Al-Qudwah] We are proceeding with our moves. We are still trying to step up pressure on the United States. We are not ready to retreat. This is what I can emphasize to you but, of course, I cannot speculate on the position the United States will ultimately take. [passage omitted]

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Qaddumi Urges U.S. To Prevent Israeli Land Move

MM1105134395 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 11 May 95 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Qaddumi Tells AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT: We Call on Washington To Prevent Israeli Expropriation of Jerusalem Land"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Tunis, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT — Faruq Qaddumi (Abu-al-Lutf), head of the PLO's Political Department, has urged the United States, in its capacity as the main sponsor of the peace process, to reactivate its role and put pressure on Israel to cancel its decision to expropriate land in East Jerusalem and to abide by the foundations on which the political settlement was based, namely Resolution 242 and the land-for-peace principle. In a statement to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT, Qaddumi warned that Israel's failure to comply with the agreements it concluded with the PLO would destroy the peace process in the Middle East.

Qaddumi was speaking on his return to Tunis from Cairo where he attended the Arab foreign ministers' emergency meeting on the recent Israeli measures. He stressed that it is now necessary to suspend the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations as soon as possible because, he explained, these negotiations are now devoid of any substance. He urged the Palestinian factions and patriotic forces and figures to hold a dialogue to agree on a political line that would in the future safeguard the Palestinian cause and our people's rights and establish just peace in accordance with the U.S. initiative of last March in implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 and the land-for-peace principle. Qaddumi said that, in his view, the resolutions passed by the Arab League Council at its recent emergency session in Cairo on the recent Israeli confiscation of 53 hectares of Palestinian land in East Jerusalem constitute a firm and unanimous Arab position on the assessment of the situation and the measures which must be taken to tackle the deterioration in the peace process, particularly as Israel has turned its back on all the pledges and commitments made in agreements it concluded with the PLO. [passage omitted]

'Arafat Reiterates Jerusalem Stand to Patriarch

JN1105192095 Jericho Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1730 GMT 11 May 95

[Report by 'Adi al-Za'nun from Gaza]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] On the occasion of the blessed 'Id al-Adha, President Yasir 'Arafat received Patriarch Bartholomeos, the most senior Greek Orthodox patriarch, and his delegation, who came to the Presidential Office in Gaza this afternoon to congratulate President 'Arafat on the blessed 'Id al-Adha. President 'Arafat welcomed the Greek Orthodox patriarch and his delegation, and said:

[Begin 'Arafat recording in Arabic followed by sentence-by-sentence Greek translation] I greet you in the name of the Palestinian people, who are living on this sacred land. As you have said, it is the land of the three divine religions. [passage omitted]

Therefore, I say before you that under our agreements, no one has the right to take any action in the holy city of Jerusalem. We have a clear U.S. letter of assurances in this regard. It was given to us by the U.S. Administration during the Madrid conference. In addition, we also have resolutions of the Security Council and the UN General Assembly, which have become part and parcel of the agreement we signed with the Israelis in Washington and Cairo under the auspices of the U.S. President and Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak, respectively.

We rely on you in protecting Jerusalem. We know your firm position in this regard. No one has the right to change what has been approved by the international community, including the Greek Orthodox Church.

We will never forget the 'Umarite Convention between Sophronius and the Muslims' caliph. Therefore, we are one people and one nation. We have a national duty, a pan-Arab duty, and a religious duty to preserve this holy city. Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. [end recording]

For his part, the Greek Orthodox patriarch stressed that the international Orthodox Church supports the National Authority and the Palestinian people. He added that he would do what he could to push the Middle East peace process forward. [passage omitted] [end recording]

U.S. Embassy Proposal Called 'Dangerous Terrorism'

MM1105102095 London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic 10 May 95 p 11

[Editorial: "Transfer of U.S. Embassy Highest Degree of Terrorism"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The U.S. presidential election candidates' feverish race to win the U.S. Jewish lobby's approval confirms that the United States has become an Israeli colony whose affairs are run from occupied Jerusalem and whose foreign and domestic policies are defined by Yitzhaq Rabin in cooperation with U.S. Jewish community leaders.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Republican Senator Robert Dole, leader of the majority in the Senate, has announced that he will submit to the Senate a draft bill designed to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to occupied Jerusalem "because Jerusalem should remain as the eternal unified capital of the State of Israel."

Dole's announcement coincided with a similar announcement by his rival Senator Gingrich, who said following a meeting with Rabin that transferring the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem would reinforce Israel's right to choose its own capital.

As for the current President, Bill Clinton, he entered the political oneupmanship early, when he announced at a World Jewish Council meeting the imposition of a full U.S. trade embargo on Iran because of its nuclear program, threatening to sever all economic and trade ties with Russia if it continues its plans to sell two nuclear reactors to Iran. By adopting this position he is espousing an urgent Israeli demand in the hope of winning Jewish votes for the sake of staying in the White House for a second term.

This official U.S. rush to kiss the shoes of the Israelis and their supporters comes while the peace process is going through a big dilemma and while the Arab region is dominated by a wave of anger and disapproval as a result of Israel's seizure of 151 hectares of land in Arab Jerusalem to build thousands of residential units to accommodate new Jewish settlers.

If the sponsor of peace in the region and the biggest superpower in the world is biased in such a manner toward the Israeli encroachment on Arab land, how can we expect from it acceptable results that would put an end to the tension between Arabs and Jews?

Transferring the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem would be not just a violation of international law, but a "terrorist step," similar to all the other terrorist operations carried out by extremist organizations in the world, the most recent of which is the Oklahoma incident. In fact we would not be exaggerating if we said that it is a more dangerous terrorism, because it torpedoes the foundations of the peace process and causes an entire people to lose hope in and call into question international laws and all Western justice values.

We expected the U.S. Administration to strongly oppose the confiscation of land in east Jerusalem, on the grounds that this action conflicts with the provisions of the Oslo agreement, which stipulates that talks on the city's future be deferred until the final phase. But we discovered that these expectations were very naive when we saw U.S. candidates competing to set up the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem on seized Arab land stolen from a religious endowment.

The response to this Israeli arrogance and blatant U.S. bias is to halt the Arab rush to negotiate and normalize relations with Israel. It is illogical for Israeli tourists to be pouring into Arab states while lands continue to be confiscated in Jerusalem and while Washington continue to plan to move its embassy there.

Some Arab states withdrew their ambassadors from Arab capitals with which they differed. And some completely closed down their embassies because of hostile press statements or articles. So do we expect the Arab states that have appointed ambassadors to Israel to take similar steps in protest at the judaizing of Jerusalem, or are these governments so weak that they cannot embark on such a step, which is in line with diplomatic protocol?

'Tangible Progress' Seen in Israeli Secret Talks

MM1105100795 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 10 May 95 p 3

[Report by Salih Qallab: "Secret Palestinian-Israeli Negotiations in Tel Aviv and Erez"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Amman — Responsible Palestinian sources have confirmed that secret negotiations are taking place between Israel and the Palestinian National Authority [PNA] in addition to the open negotiations being supervised on the Palestinian side by Nabil Sha'th, which have so far achieved nothing definite regarding the Israeli Army's redeployment in the West Bank or the autonomy elections which, under the Oslo and Cairo agreements, were supposed to take place last July.

The sources told AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT that Major General 'Abd-al-Razzaq al-Yahya, former Palestinian ambassador to Jordan and former PLO Executive Committee member, is the person engaged in these secret negotiations on the Palestinian side, assisted by Colonel Muhammad Dahlan, a PNA preventive security official, and Hasan 'Usfur, one of the senior Palestinian negotiators in the secret negotiations which led to the well-known Oslo agreements.

The same Palestinian sources said that the secret Palestinian-Israeli negotiations began several months ago when the public negotiations were deadlocked and that they have mainly focused on a detailed concept for the Israeli Army's redeployment in the West Bank including the security aspects pertaining to the Israeli settlements there.

The sources believe that the secret negotiations, held in various locations including Tel Aviv and the Erez

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

checkpoint on the northern entrance to the Gaza Strip, have made tangible progress and that the Palestinian and Israeli negotiators have managed to draw up the necessary maps showing the Israeli Army's positions in the West Bank after its redeployment in preparation for the autonomy elections expected to be held in the fall, according to Israeli statements.

As regards Israeli withdrawal from the Janin and Tubas areas, about which there has been so much speculation, the Palestinian sources said they believed that Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat was willing to agree to such a step provided that it is taken in the context of a clear timetable specifying the dates for the completion of the Israeli Army's redeployment in accordance with the provisions of the Oslo agreements.

The same sources believe that 'Arafat fears that the "Gaza- Jericho first" step could turn out to be the last step as a result of the continuous Israeli maneuvers and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin's attempts to eschew the Oslo agreements and empty them of any substance. That is why he is pushing for the extension of the PNA to any area in the West Bank, but not without specific timetables. The predominant feeling in some Palestinian official circles is that the next steps in the implementation of the Oslo agreements now depend on what happens on the Syrian-Israeli track, and that Rabin is unlikely to take any serious step in the West Bank unless there is some progress on the ground on the Syrian front for many reasons and factors related to the Israeli elections. These circles are following Rabin's current U.S. visit with extreme interest. They stress that the Israeli prime minister embarked on that visit to persuade U.S. President Bill Clinton's administration to make renewed efforts with Syria to bring about at least some progress on the Syrian-Israeli track before the Israeli elections.

It is worth noting here that Dennis Ross, coordinator of the Middle East peace process, returned from his recent tour of the region without any significant progress on the stumbling Syrian-Israeli track. Before making that trip he saw a possibility of achieving a Syrian-Israeli declaration of principles during the tour.

Palestinian Grouping Head Interviewed

95AA0139A London FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH in Arabic Apr 95 pp 16-18

["Text" of interview with Palestinian Grouping Secretary Bassam al-Shak'ah by unidentified correspondent in Nabulus; date not given — first two paragraphs are FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH introduction]

[FBIS Translated Text] Bassam al-Shak'ah is the secretary of the new Palestinian Grouping [PG] recently established in the occupied territories. The Grouping, al-Shak'ah says, does not regard itself as a substitute to the PLO, because it is working to unite the Palestinian people and forces. The Grouping is just beginning its activity to free the national will and restore national unity. Al-Shak'ah adds that the idea to establish the PG was formed when they realized that the Palestinian issue was facing a crisis and that the Zionist entity was exploiting the contradictions among the Palestinian forces opposed to the Zionist plan. He also noted that the PLO leadership has also exploited these contradictions to unilaterally sign the Oslo agreement.

FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH conducted a comprehensive interview with Bassam al-Shak'ah, secretary of the PG. He talked in detail and total frankness about the PG's birth, priorities, aims, and hopes. The full text of the interview follows:

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] How was the idea to establish the PG formed?

[Al-Shak'ah] The idea to establish the PG was formed after we realized that the Palestinian issue and the Palestinian national struggle were facing a crisis. The differences and contradictions among the forces opposed to the imperialist-Zionist program have allowed the PLO leadership to unilaterally sign the Oslo agreements, which had no justification on the ground. Neither had Israel changed and recognized our people's national and human rights nor had the United States—after the collapse of the Soviet Union—abandoned its alliance with Israel, ceased to consider it as imperialism's economic, military, and political base, and adhered to international legitimacy. The contrary was true; the United States imposed its hegemony on the world and the United Nations, including its Security Council and institutions, and began using them to perpetuate its domination, ensure its interests and monopolies, and undermine and subdue the liberation forces.

As for our people, the factional policy dictated from above has weakened the people's intifadah and undermined their unity and zeal. This enabled the PLO leadership to carry out its policy in the vacuum that was created as a result of the absence of unity.

The Oslo agreements highlighted the contradictions between the people and the Self-Rule Authority. The forces opposed to the agreements were unable to achieve unity to regain the people's will that was confiscated by the PLO leadership. This has led to frustration among the people, who lost the national alternative, represented in the PLO and its policy, which led to the inauspicious Oslo and Cairo agreements.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] Which are the forces participating in the Grouping? How can you avoid the contradictions among them?

[Al-Shak'ah] In view of what I said earlier, we were faced with the urgent challenge to unite the forces opposed to surrender, as the Oslo agreement did not end the occupation. We continued our efforts until we finally succeeded in establishing the PG. From the beginning, we concentrated on bringing together the Palestinian Islamic, patriotic, and national forces and key figures. We sought to unite their efforts to defend the rights of their people and nation, work to liberate their homeland and will, and achieve freedom and independence. This is instead of fighting each other, and thus weakening themselves, missing their target, and causing frustration among their people. We are all being targeted. There is no place for competition among us while we are still languishing under the harshest and meanest racist occupation and facing the Zionist political and ideological dangers. We cannot do that through traditional democratic means and the existence of conflicting opinions. We cannot do that without common goals and under a multiparty system of contradictory, opposed, and conflicting opinions, as was the case before. This will jeopardize all our historic achievements. We failed in our attempts to fight the autonomy plan. Our people fought and foiled the Camp David agreement. Yet, the PLO leadership went ahead and concluded the Oslo agreement. The intifadah, which embodied the Palestinian national will, has suffered a setback. The PLO leadership has become the ruler over our people, implementing its agreements with the people's enemies.

Therefore, all the ideologies opposed to the Oslo agreement are being targeted. The people are being targeted, the Arab nation is being targeted, and the Muslims and the forces of liberation and progress in the world are being targeted. Even world peace is being targeted. All ideologies are targeting the citizen to achieve their goals. Therefore, we must stand united against the common danger. We must all join hands in defending the people's rights and struggle for the sake of their future. We also must mobilize the people's support for this purpose. Struggle by each faction to win the people's support involves competition over principles and ideologies. Contradiction and conflict undermine the people's capabilities and will keep them away from the various organizations and parties. The people's aim is to free themselves from the occupation and achieve independence. This cannot be achieved by any one party separately, as it will not be able to remove the occupation or assume power. If this happens, this party would be solving a problem or an issue for its own benefit, but would be creating a big internal problem that would jeopardize its achievements. Therefore, the PG is the right framework for resolving the differences among the various factions, correcting their relations, and amending their competition. It unites them against their common enemies.

In my opinion, the political differences among the various political factions do not contradict, in Islamic thought, with the national reality. There are no contradictions between a pan-Arabist, a nationalist, and an Islamist. Mankind is the basis of their belief. Nationalism and patriotism demand a geographical, historical, and social reality. They unite the people. Socially and historically, Islam is one of the most important bases of nationalism and patriotism. The philosophy and ideology of a government system are related to what the people think. Therefore, you will find several conflicting ideologies among the various parties. However, the people are the ones who decide. We must not deceive our people and create physical and mental divisions among them through disagreements.

One must be aware of these things to avoid the dangers of disagreement and contradiction inside the same body and, thus, deprive our enemies, the deviators, and opportunists of their most important weapons.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] Does the PG have an extension outside the occupied territories?

[Al-Shak'ah] The PG was founded inside the occupied territories. It was the result of many experiences inside and outside the occupied territories. It is a Palestinian grouping for the Palestinian issue. Two thirds of the Palestinian people live outside the occupied territories. The Palestinian issue is also an Arab, Islamic, and humanitarian issue in context and dimension. The issue also has a Christian dimension, which is being weakened by the positions of the United States and the European states and their alliance with Zionism.

While the PG was started here, the factions represented in it have extensions outside, which also approve of the PG. The declared positions so far have been positive. Anyhow, the PG is seeking to unite the Palestinian forces to liberate the popular will and prevent it from being confiscated through unilateral decisions and the Oslo and Cairo agreements. It is also seeking close cooperation with the various Arab, Islamic, and international forces.

The establishment of the PG was not motivated by a desire to be different from the others. It was established in response to necessities and needs, whose negative effects on our struggle and cause remained dormant and persistent. Our ambition is to unite our people's forces.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Some of us are members of factions outside the occupied territories, such as the 10 groups and the Palestinian Democratic Grouping [Palestinian opposition factions in Syria], which include leaders from Fatah, national figures, and the Popular, Democratic, and Arab Fronts. While the Democratic Grouping does not include Islamic factions, the PG here does not include Fatah opposition representatives. What matters, in our opinion, is that the others share our ambition to liberate the national will by uniting our people and their struggle. We will inevitably achieve our goal, because the crisis we are facing will prompt all the sincere people to favorably respond to our appeal.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] It is expected that you will directly oppose the Oslo agreement and its appendices. This would mean clashing with the Self-Rule Authority. How will you deal with this situation?

[Al-Shak'ah] The Oslo agreement did not liberate the land nor the national will. The agreement granted legitimacy to the occupation authorities and their hostile objectives. At the same time, the PLO leadership subordinated itself to these authorities. Therefore, resisting the agreement and the occupation is a process of liberation from a continuing aggression. It is not true that the agreement will guarantee that our people will achieve their rights, because the agreement and all its mechanisms have lost the basis to achieve this. The PLO leadership should conclude that it has reached an impasse. It should adopt a stand and return to the people and not to Rabin, Peres, Christopher, or Husni Mubarak. It should announce the failure of the agreement. Our priority is not confronting the Self-Rule Authority, but confronting the agreements and their implementation, because they are designed against our freedom and will. The West Bank and more than one quarter of the Gaza Strip are still under direct occupation. It is possible that the Self-Rule Authority will confront us, because it insists on implementing the agreements, despite Israel's expansionist designs, control of the border, failure to release the detainees, and the intensification of its repression. Our option is to struggle for freedom and independence, and our weapon is national unity and reconciliation.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] What are the possibilities of dialogue with the Palestinian Authority?

[Al-Shak'ah] No indications exist for possible dialogue, because the Authority clearly wants to maintain its policy and implement the Oslo agreement. Its call for dialogue is not sincere. It is seeking to rally the support of the opposition as part of the game that led to the Oslo agreement. It needs the support of the opposition to regain the legitimacy it is beginning to lose. The national forces are losing hope that the Self-Rule Authority would change its course. So they began calling for Arafat's resignation. Basic conditions must exist for dialogue, and this is impossible without a statement declaring that the Oslo agreements have failed and that it would be futile to continue this process.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] Is the PG an alternative to the PLO?

[Al-Shak'ah] The leadership has destroyed the PLO by secretly negotiating with Israel and then unilaterally signing the inauspicious agreements, contrary to the legitimate resolutions of the Palestine National Council and the National Charter. It has frozen the PLO's institutions, depending on a group of hypocrites. The Palestinian authority even announced the cancellation of the Charter and characterized the national struggle as terrorism. What I want to say is that the PLO has frozen its institutions and lost its decision-making authority long ago as a result of its leadership's unilateral, factional, and authoritarian policy. This policy has led some forces to withdraw from the PLO to carry out their opposition activity. Some forces, like Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] and Islamic Jihad, have remained outside the PLO because of their criticism and conditions. This policy also has led some forces and figures to freeze their membership or resign from the Executive Committee, the Palestine National Council, and the Central Council. The PG does not consider itself an alternative to the PLO, despite what I said before, because it is working to unite the Palestinian people to liberate the national will, regain our people's national unity, and liberate the PLO to again become a legitimate representative and united leadership of our people.

The PG thinks that insistence on democratic reform within the framework of the PLO is a waste of time, because the Palestinian Authority will prevent that. This is beyond its control, as it is governed by the Oslo and Cairo agreements. Democratic reform will turn the national struggle and its field operations into technical matters, detached from the growing practices of the occupation against our people and their genuine national forces. Therefore, uniting our people and their forces to confront the aggression and defend our people's rights is the way to the restoration of our people's unity within the PLO. Anyhow, voices have begun calling for elections to the Palestine National Council. The PG is not among them. It is calling for a national unity to enable our people to impose their will.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] What is the difference between the PG and the 10 opposition Palestinian groups?

[Al-Shak'ah] The PG was established in the occupied territories. As I said, it is not a substitute to or a

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

competitor of the 10 groups, but embodies what they were unable to achieve for unknown reasons. The PG is interested in achieving unity to liberate the national will. Furthermore, not all the forces in the PG are represented in the 10 groups, and the opposite is true. We have forces that are members in both. All these factors are helpful in achieving unity.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] Do you think that the Palestinian people need new parties to sponsor their causes?

[Al-Shak'ah] The truth is that the Palestinian people do not need additional nominal parties. They need quality-type parties to deal and activate what is present. One aspect of the crisis facing the national struggle is that the people are frustrated and detached from the organizations for various reasons, including the lack of national unity and the absence of a representational decision-making body. This situation made the national movement lose support for its goals in the Arab, Islamic, and international arenas, in the face of formal support to the official Palestinian authority. For this reason, there is a feeling that the Palestinian people need a mechanism to resolve the crisis facing the national movement. This is a historic responsibility. The PG was a development in this direction. It is a grouping and not a new party to be added to what exists now.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] What are the PG's chances of success in the light of the conditions through which the Palestinian people are passing?

[Al-Shak'ah] As I said, the national issue and struggle need help. I think that the forces and figures who established the PG believe in its message, because it responds to certain needs to resolve the crisis. The PG is bound to face obstacles and difficulties, whether from within or from outside. However, its members are determined to meet the challenges and tackle the difficulties. I think that the founding declaration was a considerable success. The general atmosphere that accompanied the PG's creation was encouraging. In our opinion, the PG contains all the elements of success. We hope that the other forces and the people will respond to this comprehensive national responsibility, because they are the ones who make and reap the fruits of success.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] There is ambiguity about Hamas's participation in the PG. What is the truth about this?

[Al-Shak'ah] I have read a statement in the AL-QUDS newspaper by Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah, official spokesman of the Hamas Movement, in which he says that they have not received an invitation to join the PG, and they are not members in it. Before that, I read a report in the same newspaper, citing me as saying that Hamas and Islamic Jihad are members in the PG. The report called me the founder of the PG. It also cited me as saying that the Democratic Front and the Popular Front are members in the PG. When I read the last report, you were one of the people I contacted to say that the report was distorted. I am not the founder. The PG was established as a result of joint efforts that lasted for a long time. I am the secretary of the PG and not the founder.

As for Hamas and other groups mentioned in the report, the reference was to trends and not organizations. So what I said was also misinterpreted. I did not say that Hamas is a member in the PG. I said that it participated in the dialogue and then suspended its participation after three of its representatives in the dialogue were arrested. I have said, and I say now, that we have not received Hamas's agreement or refusal to participate in the PG. We are keen to coordinate with it, and I think it feels the same, because it did not express any opposition during our dialogue. Mentioning the Democratic Front and the Popular Front in the report, and not the groups, was deliberate, I think. I cannot say who was responsible for it. Was it the correspondent, the newspaper that published the statement, or the newspaper from which the statement was quoted? AL-QUDS was not responsible for it, because the same text was published in the Amman newspapers, which could indicate the source of the mistake. As you remember, I contacted you then about the distortions. I also contacted many others. However, it seems that the reactions were regrettably faster than the precautions. Brother Ibrahim Ghawshah, who is known for his ability, qualifications, and his accuracy, reacted after reading the reports in the Amman press. My complaint is that he did not try to find the truth as I stated it now, which is 100 percent correct. I would not have been interested in publishing this information had it not been for the attempt of some people to underestimate the value of the PG and the historic importance of its establishment. Likewise, the attempt to mention only the names of the Democratic Front and the Popular Front and not the others was meant to cause confusion. The public must be careful about such good or bad intentioned attempts.

In short, Hamas took part in the production, but has not communicated its official decision to us to become a member. This is what I have always tried to explain, although I think that brother Ibrahim Ghawshah's statement can be misinterpreted.

[FILASTIN AL-MUSLIMAH] Is there a possibility that the PG will participate in any Palestinian elections inside the territories?

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

[Al-Shak'ah] We are talking about elections without knowing whether they will take place or not and, if they do take place, on what basis. What is certain is that the elections are part of the Oslo and Cairo agreements. At the beginning, they were talking about an administrative council, according to the provisions of the agreement. The issue was discussed. Some people expressed opposition to the administrative council's election under the Oslo agreement and readiness to participate in free legislative elections. The issue was discussed by the Israeli-Palestinian negotiating committees. A deliberate disinformation campaign began to arouse interest in the issue as part of the normalization process. The question is: Will the results of elections that violate the Oslo and Cairo agreements be accepted? I have my own suspicions about the motives for raising the slogan of elections. I hope that the popular forces will be aware of the game and its goals and will wait for the results of the negotiations to determine their stand. Emerging from one of the negotiating sessions, Dr. Nabil Sha'th has recently stated that he can confirm that whoever runs in the elections can be sure they will be free and honest. What he meant was whoever nominates himself or is allowed to nominate himself in the elections. Will the elections be for a legislative council? Will the council have the authority to amend or cancel the provisions of the agreement? Will it have the authority to make laws?

All the opposition forces must separately decide their positions on the elections. The PG will promote these positions. What is important is: Will there be elections, and what kind?

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Algeria

Former Minister: State Must Use 'Legal Violence'

LD1205063695 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in French 1703 GMT 11 May 95

[Interview with former Prime Minister Redha Malek, leader of the newly-founded Republican National Alliance, by unidentified correspondents, from the 'Forum' program — live or recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Correspondent] Redha Malek: you were prime minister from August 1993 to April 1994 after being a member of the Higher State Council [HSC]. You have had a diplomatic career; you were ambassador in several major capitals, including Moscow, Washington, Paris, and London. You were also minister of culture in 1977. You were a member of the delegation taking part in the Evian talks [with the French in 1961-1962] and you were also among those who negotiated the release of the U.S. hostages detained in Iran between November 1980 and January 1981.

In this program, we will talk about the crisis in general, with its recent and current aspects, and about what you are proposing through the Republican National Alliance. We will also talk about the role of this movement in the current political configuration.

Since you left your post of prime minister in April 1994, you have not made yourself heard that much. We will start this program with this question: What is the reason behind this silence? Is it reserve or is it the silence of an observer?

[Malek] You talk about silence but you must say after all that I have observed a relative silence since I left the government. I am not in the habit of talking just for the sake of it. However, I have had the opportunity to express myself with statements on a number of issues which seemed important to me.

The dialogue, as you know full well, took place at the level of the HSC. When the HSC was disbanded, the dialogue was launched again by Mr. Liamine Zeroual, the state president. The state made many efforts in this respect in order to bring this dialogue to fruition. Naturally, this dialogue, which lasted several months, came up inevitably against one focal point, namely that of terrorism. Should terrorism be condemned or not? Can the state negotiate with people who continue to slit throats, kill and burn? This is the essential question which was raised on several occasions throughout this dialogue. In the end we had to acknowledge that this issue remained unsolved. People continue to say that violence exists on both sides. We put on the same level....

[Correspondent, interrupting] In other words, the issue is the condemnation of violence?

[Malek] The condemnation of terrorism is a fundamental issue and we cannot avoid it, regardless of the way the situation evolves and regardless of the good intentions of the people involved in this dialogue.

[Correspondent] To put it more clearly: logically any progress in the dialogue ought to be linked to the settlement of this central point?

[Malek] Absolutely. Because today terrorism threatens the nation in its foundations. It threatens the existence of the state. It also threatens the population in its daily life. It is not possible to keep things as they are and turn a blind eye to this extremely serious phenomenon which endangers everything that has been done in this country since the revolution and also since independence. This situation must stop. However, this does not mean that the state, which exercises legal violence since it applies the law.... [changes thought] A state must exercise [legal violence] against those who rise up against it, those who rise up against public order, people and their property. We cannot, the state cannot remain passive; it has to react. This is a basic fact. It is really sad that we have to repeat such obvious facts in order to show that they exist and that they have their importance.

A state worthy of this name uses legal violence which is a major constitutional attribute. It is a provided for by the constitution. Therefore we cannot put the state on the same level as a faction which took up arms and which started shooting at members of the public, slitting the throats of young girls and burning schools down. It is not possible. We must be clear about this.

So long as we, in other words the political class in general, and particularly those who are orchestrating this violence, have not taken a very clear stand on this issue, there will be no progress toward a political solution of the problem.

[Correspondent] Going back to my first question: I said that since you left [the government] in April 1994, you adopted a somewhat reserved position, so how can you briefly assess the general situation since then?

[Malek] I think that we are moving toward a clarification of the situation. Our role is to help in this process by clarifying the political climate. What is the clarification? It is to say that we must be aware of the following:

One: that there is a fundamentalist terrorism which is real and which is threatens the very existence of the nation. We must not play down the danger of this phenomenon. If we let it develop or continue we risk putting the nation in real danger, in danger of its life,

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

because these people have their own conception which they want to impose through terror. Their methods are known to everybody. Algerian intellectuals are being killed; we can give the number of your journalist colleagues who were assassinated; and we can also give the number of scholars, lecturers, doctors and men of culture who were physically liquidated. Can any society remain silent in front of this programmed barbarism?

[Correspondent] In other words, your position is firmness?

[Malek] When you have such a phenomenon, not only do we need to be firm, but the entire society must be aware of it. We must not play down terrorism or make it look insignificant because it has taken extremely serious proportions in this country. The latest action against technical assistants in the south, near Ghardaia, confirms the deadly danger of this phenomenon. Some want to force the state to go down on its knees by giving in to this blackmail: if the state does not give in then we are going to kill the foreigners who work here even if it means isolating Algeria from the rest of the world and even if Algeria sinks deeper at the economical level. These gentlemen could not care less. They want to come to power by all means.

[Correspondent] You talk about the fundamentalist terrorism?

[Malek] Of course.

[Correspondent] But there also political parties which describe this fundamentalist terrorism as people's resistance; I am only quoting the term used in some statements.

[Malek] Here we disagree with this expression. We believe that under the current circumstances things must be clear: terrorism is terrorism. When a 16-year old girl is killed outside her school and when her head is shown to her classmates, this cannot be called people's resistance. It is unacceptable and I refuse to describe this act as an act of resistance. It is extremely serious. In this respect, I believe that there is a deviation within the political class. I do not want to point the finger at anyone but we notice that there is a serious deviation and this deviation will lead nowhere.

[Correspondent] To start the second part of the program, can you talk to us about the mission of this movement [Republican National Alliance] which, you say, is not a political party?

[Malek] Yes. Our intention was not to create yet another political party. The intention is to bring people together around a current of ideas which we consider to be a necessary current in order to take Algeria out of the crisis. Although the fight against terrorism is developing at the security level, we still consider that we must complement this action by the security forces with political action, because the expression of this action has so far been insufficient at the political level [as heard]. In other words, translating the action by the security forces into political action is to mobilize the population and explain to public opinion what is currently at stake, show what terrorism is, what fundamentalism is, and by contrast what the state is, what the nation is, and what modernity is.

[Correspondent] Mr. Malek, excuse me. Regarding the denunciation of terrorism, you are aware that numerous demonstrations have been staged, and are still being staged, in various towns and cities of the country. I just wanted to remind you of this to say that the population is reacting.

[Malek] Exactly. The population has reacted and we are convinced that the overwhelming majority of the Algerian people rejects terrorism. However, this rejection, which is radical, must express itself at the level of the political class which for its part continues to sidestep this issue by talking about putting on a par the violence of the state and that of terrorism. This is unacceptable; I do not want to repeat myself, I have just said it.

Today we must be aware of the seriousness of the situation which has been brought about by the consequences of this terrorism. Furthermore, the state is doing what it can to contain and hold back this phenomenon but we say that the population must also be mobilized in a more continuous and more coherent manner and around clear watchwords.

[Correspondent] Are you talking about a political program, a program for society?

[Malek] Of course. First of all, talking about the program for society, we say that on the one hand there is what is known as the Islamic tendency, which has its own program and its armed wing to defend it. It is defending it with terrorism. Naturally, we do not think that this program is useful for this country because it will take us backward and to a situation which is unacceptable for a country such as Algeria, which has had its revolution, after all, which is one hour away from Europe, and which already has its own characteristics and its permanent principles and ideals, which evolved within the national movement prior to the 1 November revolution, during the armed revolution, and also since independence. [passage omitted]

We say that the alternative is a new way of thinking, a new way of taking action, and a new way of governing. That is it. This is why we are proposing the democratic

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

national program. Why national? Because the nation is still at risk. It is not only democracy which is at risk in this country, but it is also the nation which is currently in peril. The nation must recover itself; the nation must reinforce its unity and its cohesion in order to face up to the challenge of the century.

[Correspondent] We will have the opportunity to go back to every point. One of the actions advocated by the Republican National Alliance is to contain the fundamentalist subversion. The question is: with what means, apart from those already being used?

[Malek] Apart from the means already in use, as I have told you, we must mobilize the nation. So far, we have not succeeded in mobilizing the nation. It has not been done. It cannot be done by political parties that make balanced speeches and which, therefore, remain on the surface. We must go deeper and we must see that the nation rejects this phenomenon of terrorism. Therefore, it must be mobilized by a political plan in order to bring about a mechanism that rejects this phenomenon once and for all. This is a possibility, and in any case there is no other if we want to overcome the crisis. [passage omitted]

Why have we created this movement? To explain this idea, this central idea which cannot be avoided. We can talk to everyone. We are ready to talk but we must talk rationally and seriously.

[Correspondent] By everyone, you mean all the political parties?

[Malek] All the political parties. We are ready to talk to everyone to explain our ideas and the motives that push us to act. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Regarding fundamentalism, do you not think that it is fabricated?

[Malek] You are opening a different debate. What I can say is that it was tolerated by the authorities and there was maybe even collusion. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Do you reject this basic opposition between Islam and modernity? In your book you talk about theology and modernity.

[Malek] Yes. There is a way....

[Correspondent, interrupting] In other words, you put yourself at the level of thinking?

[Malek] We must work, and this should be the real work that must be carried out by scholars and theologians worthy of this name, to see how we can adapt this great religion of Islam to the modern world. There is a way of adapting it. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] So the action of your movement is not within the scope of a specific date, I have the presidential elections in mind, it goes beyond, does it not? I would like to ask you a specific question about the presidential elections: Is your movement considering, now or maybe in the near future, in the next few months, either putting forward a candidate or supporting a candidate from the same trend?

[Malek] As democrats, we would like to entrench democracy. Naturally, this movement has just been created but it will take a position on all these issues, that is for sure. We will make our position known on the matter.

[Correspondent] In other words, you have started thinking....

[Malek] No, I mean give us time to organize ourselves quickly and to meet in order to discuss all these problems. [passage omitted]

If they really wanted to resolve the crisis they should have at least asked the opinion of the people here, the opinion of the authorities. It is with the authorities that the crisis must be resolved and not with foreign organizations.

In this case, without spending too much time on this since I had already said, in a statement, after the assassination of a young Algerian cadre, Bediar, God bless his soul, soon after the Sant Egidio meeting. I would have liked our friends who went to Sant Egidio to try and impose on the representatives of the terrorist Islamist trend... [pauses] and tell them: It is enough, do not play with fire, that it is not the way to do it. Instead, they aligned themselves with them. This is unacceptable; I say it openly; it is my opinion. [passage omitted]

The situation is still very difficult and we must work at it. We will see clearer by working at it. We cannot see clearer by remaining passive. We must act and by acting we clarify matters and we will contribute, I hope, to clarifying the situation.

Government Approves Draft Order on Privatization

LD1005153295 Algiers Radio Algiers Network in Arabic 1200 GMT 10 May 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] The council of government met yesterday under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Mokdad Sifi. At this meeting the council of government studied and passed a draft order regarding the privatization of public enterprises. This draft had been enriched by the proposals made by the economic and social partners at the last tripartite meeting.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

A statement issued by the state presidency after the meeting explains that the draft for this order is considered an important measure in the implementation of the industrial restructuring program, the outlines of which were approved by the council of ministers at their meeting on 29 January. The statement adds that the draft order on privatization sets out very clearly the areas of privatization and the targeted spheres of activity. It explains that privatization might be confined to the direction sphere, which would be transferred to private directors.

The statement stresses that privatization operations will be undertaken in complete transparency and will be carried out by a special committee aided by a privatization council. Another independent committee will be charged with monitoring the process. [passage omitted]

Egypt

Delegate: Country 'Does Not Support' NPT Extension

NC1105210195 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1820 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] United Nations, New York, 11 May (MENA) — Egypt has declared that it does not support the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] which was adopted this evening. It said that the method used to achieve this extension was not the best possible nor most auspicious method and might produce adverse results.

The Egyptian position was outlined in a statement delivered tonight by Ambassador Nabil al-'Arabi, Egypt's permanent representative at the United Nations, to the closing session of the NPT conference in New York. Following is the text of the statement:

Mr. President, after the conference adopted the four resolutions pertaining to the NPT extension with a majority vote, the Egyptian delegation, following official instructions, wishes to put Egypt's position on record.

First, Egypt supports the NPT, will continue to abide by its provisions, and will seek to further its aims on the grounds that it is an important pillar of international peace and security. Notwithstanding, Egypt believes that the method used to attain the extension was not the best nor the most auspicious method and might produce adverse results.

In this connection, Egypt believes that the four resolutions adopted today constitute an integrated whole that reflects the NPT signatories' concerns and priorities; the importance of continuing the treaty; and the need to abide by its provisions, carry out an effective review of its functions, and attach special priority to the Middle East to guarantee that all regional countries join it, thus effectively proclaiming the Middle East a region free of nuclear weapons.

Egypt's support for the treaty's aims and purposes comes from its firm belief in the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to seek their eventual total elimination. Egypt also believes that the possession of nuclear weapons by any country in the Middle East poses a threat to the security of all the region's countries and that this can have serious regional and international implications. Moreover, the use of a double standard upsets the fine balance of regional and international relations.

Third [as received], out of our wish to safeguard the treaty's principles and help to implement its provisions and objectives, we, the signatories, must frankly confront the weaknesses and shortcomings evident in the implementation of the treaty's commitments. I begin by noting that the NPT lacks a global character, that the process of disarmament that is implemented according to the treaty's sixth article is extremely slow, that the treaty lacks guarantees for the security of nonnuclear countries, and that UN Security Council Resolutions 255 and 984 do not provide any deterrent security guarantees for nonnuclear countries. I also wish to point out that the International Atomic Energy Agency's [IAEA] system of inspection should be enhanced and made more efficient. Further, there is a lack of balance in rights and obligations between nuclear and nonnuclear countries, despite the fact that the treaty is 25 years old.

Doubtlessly, all NPT signatories, particularly nuclear countries, must seek to remedy the treaty's shortcomings and impart a global character to it by meticulously and fairly implementing its provisions in order to achieve its objectives in the best way possible.

Because the treaty lacks a global character, the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons persists and will become greater with time. Conditions in the Middle East underline this danger in view of Israel's vague nuclear capabilities which are not subject to international supervision.

This unequal status is unacceptable. Regional and international efforts to remedy it are necessary. It is on this premise that Egypt made its well-known initiative to turn the Middle East into a region free of weapons of mass destruction. It submitted the initiative out of its clear perception of the necessary requirements of peace and stability in this sensitive region. President Mubarak's 1990 initiative to turn the Middle East into a region free of weapons of mass destruction was well in line with regional and international developments.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

In this context I wish to note that the special resolution on the Middle East—that the conference adopted a few minutes ago and that was also adopted by the NPT's three repository states because of its importance—basically seeks to impart a global character to the NPT by urging all Middle Eastern countries, notably Israel—because it is the only regional country with nuclear facilities not subject to IAEA safeguards—to join the treaty. The resolution also stresses the importance of taking the necessary steps to free the Middle East of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction expeditiously. The resolution believes such action is a step in the right direction and necessary follow-up measures must be taken.

Continuing suspicions on the proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East forebodes a regional arms race with all the dangers it entails and the negative message it sends to the parties to the NPT that their accession to the treaty has not achieved security and stability against nuclear dangers. This is how we feel. And that is why we call on the Security Council to avert such a feeling by quickly acting to ensure the safety and stability of the Middle East.

Egypt will inform the Security Council of this and will ask it to shoulder its responsibility to remove the weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East in accordance with the provisions of the UN Charter and within the framework of the council's summit statement in 1992 and its resolutions in this regard. This is because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to world peace and security. We will also call on the Middle East Arms Control Committee to intensify its efforts and to take specific and concrete steps in this vital sphere for the security of the region and the world at large.

Mr. President: The indefinite extension of the treaty before achieving its universality ignores an essential fact; namely, that it actually represents a demand to several states, especially those in the Middle East, to assume permanent obligations in non-proliferation of nuclear weapons without a similar demand from or obligation on the part of Israel, which has nuclear installations that are not subject to safeguards. This perpetuates a structural defect in rights and duties, threatening national, regional, and international security.

In view of this situation and in view of our reading of history, it is crystal clear that the indefinite extension of the treaty does not conform with our view of how to build a new Middle East free from tension and weapons of mass destruction. It also does not conform with our concept of the structure of correct relations among the peoples of all the states of the region.

Inspired by its firm approach to peace and backed by the provisions and objectives of the treaty, Egypt will continue to work to achieve the universality of the treaty, and especially toward the accession of all the states of the region, particularly Israel, to the treaty so that the components of peace and confidence-building in the region will be completed on the bases of justice, equality, and balanced security for all parties. This is an indispensable step for achieving credible peace, preventing nuclear proliferation, and realizing one of mankind's most noble objectives, namely, nuclear disarmament.

Egypt has participated and will participate in the treaty review conferences out of a firm political belief that it is necessary for the treaty to achieve its ultimate objectives.

Finally, the Egyptian delegation registers its stance by affirming that Egypt does not support the indefinite extension in light of the objective and security considerations referred to. Therefore, Egypt will not join the states that have chosen the indefinite extension. For the treaty to be eternal, it must be universal without discrimination and with the agreement of all parties.

Daily Urges UN Resolution on Land Expropriation

NC1205064895 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0605 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Cairo, 12 May (MENA) — AL-JUMHURIYAH expresses the hope that during its meeting today the Security Council will pass a resolution compelling Israel to comply with international legality and reverse its decision to seize Palestinian land, which is a clear violation of international charters and agreements on the treatment of inhabitants in occupied territories by the occupation troops.

In its editorial today the paper notes that the atmosphere is now ripe within the Security Council to reach a resolution that meets the seriousness of the situation, prepares the ground for implementing the second stage of the Palestinian-Israeli Declaration of Principles, and puts the future of Jerusalem on the negotiating table.

The paper fears that the U.S. Administration, as usual, may interfere by vetoing the resolution, thus turning it into a mere document to be shelved in the UN files along with dozens of other resolutions dealing with the Palestinian issue.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Commentary Says Peace Process at 'Critical Juncture'

NC1105131595 Cairo Arab Republic of Egypt Radio Network in Arabic 1140 GMT 11 May 95

[Commentary by Muhammad Sharaf: "Egypt's Firm Stance on Correct Bases of Peace in the Middle East"]

[FBIS Translated Text] In light of some Israeli statements and stances in the past few weeks, it is clear that the peace process in the Middle East is at a critical juncture. Real dangers are threatening this process.

President Mubarak is closely following up developments in this process in their most minute details. This week he met Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat and Israeli Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres and reviewed with them the recent developments in this process, especially regarding two topics closely connected with the necessary bases for establishing peace in the region. The first topic is the Jerusalem issue and the recent developments resulting from the Israeli authorities' decision to confiscate Palestinian land in east Jerusalem. The second topic is the removal of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction from the Middle East. In addition, Mubarak reviewed with 'Arafat and Peres developments in the peace process on the Palestinian and Syrian tracks.

Although Egypt's stance on the necessary and correct bases for establishing a just and comprehensive peace between the Arab states and Israel is known, we will focus on recent developments in the Jerusalem issue and the nuclear weapons issue with an objective analysis with a view to reaffirming Egypt's firm stance.

The Jerusalem issue does not need much explanation. The gap between the Arab and Islamic stance and the Israeli stance on this issue is very wide. We are not mistaken if we say that unless Israel changes its stance on unifying Jerusalem and considering it its capital, it is very doubtful that the desired peace will ever be reached between the Palestinians and Arabs on one side and Israel on the other. The crucial point in this thorny and very sensitive issue is that east Jerusalem is part of the Palestinian territories. The principles, rules, and international agreements that apply to the other occupied Arab territories also apply to east Jerusalem. But Israel does not pay attention to all this and insists on its ludicrous stance. This stance, which disregards the entire international community, its charters, laws, and norms, is exemplified in provocative remarks by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin during his visit to Washington this week. Rabin said Israel lives according to its own rules; it has made its decision to unify Jerusalem, realizing that no state in the world recognizes Jerusalem's unification. If we add what events and developments have proved since the Israeli occupation imposed its control on the Islamic and Christian holy places, namely, that the sanctity of these places is not protected and the freedom of worship in them is not safeguarded, we will find out how grave Israel's stance is and how Jerusalem can become a dangerous flashpoint between the two sides.

If we discuss the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, we see that although Egypt has announced it opposes the indefinite extension of the Treaty, it will not withdraw from it, because the Treaty has particular privileges and a basic framework, which Egypt does not oppose. Regardless of the outcome of the New York conference, Egypt's stance on the need to clear the Middle East of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction is firm and consistent. Egypt will not change this stance, because it is closely linked with its national security and the security of the region.

No matter what, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to establish normal relations between Israel and its neighbors under the shadow of the Israeli nuclear threat and blackmail. The near and not so distant future will in any case clear up the situation in all its aspects.

Foreign Financing of 'Extremist Elements' Exposed

MM1105131695 London AL-MAJALLAH in Arabic 7-13 May 95 p 18

[Unattributed report: "$5 Million for Extremist Groups in Egypt Over Three Years"]

[FBIS Translated Text] AL-MAJALLAH has learned that an Egyptian report on the activities of extremist organizations in Egypt over the past three years, from the beginning of 1992 to the end of last year, confirmed that the foreign financing available to the groups operating in Egypt totaled $5 million, equivalent to 20 million Egyptian pounds. The report said that foreign financing is transferred through banks in Italy, Greece, and Cyprus to Jordan and from there to extremist elements. And that Egyptian security services have succeeded in uncovering the financing sources and the methods used to transfer the money to these groups.

The report pointed out that the security services' detection and uncovering of the financing sources has contributed to curbing terrorist operations. And that 1993 was the golden year in terms of the terrorist elements' receipt of foreign money. The legislative amendments introduced to the law on the secrecy of accounts to uncover the sources of financing for terrorism have helped to make the security plan a success.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

The report pointed out that a number of fugitive "Egyptian Afghans" outside Egypt financed extremist elements in the country by using the money available to them since their participation in the Afghan war, and that Jihad group elements got the biggest share of the financing, followed by the Vanguards of Conquest group and the Islamic Group.

National Conference To Discuss Nuclear Dangers

95LD0039A Cairo AL-AHRAM AL-DUWALI in Arabic 13 Feb 95 p 3

[Article by Muhammad Ta'imah: "National Conference To Discuss Nuclear Dangers and the Future of the Nonproliferation Treaty"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Since the peoples of the Arab nation want a just and lasting peace that will provide them with permanent rights, it is important to eliminate the factors preventing this. Among the most prominent of these factors, certainly, is the security imbalance among the region's nations. One of the most obvious examples of this is Israel's attempts to retain its nuclear weapons and to further develop them so that the anticipated agreements will be executed in its favor under the shadow of these weapons that threaten the existence of the Arab nation and all the peoples of the region.

The Arab nation's peoples want to achieve equivalent security and a just peace and establish relations with other countries on the basis of mutual interests. In keeping with this, a number of organizations and research centers have begun to call for establishment of a communications network for civil and nongovernmental organizations under the title "Cooperation for Security, Peace, and Nuclear Disarmament" in order to continue working toward this goal. These organizations have agreed to call for mounting a worldwide campaign to be accompanied by discussion of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty's coming into force and review. The campaign will be designed to reach a peak as the conference about the treaty is being convened between 17 April and 12 May of this year in New York.

There is no doubt that participation by the nongovernmental organizations in various parts of the world as this important issue is being raised is an opportunity to bring the issue of Israel's possession of nuclear weapons to the attention of world public opinion. It can also serve to convince the organizations in various countries and continents of the dangers arising from Israel's rejection of this treaty and its refusal to subject its nuclear facilities to the inspection regimen that the International Atomic Energy Agency follows, while all Arab nations are committed to implementing the provisions of this agreement and to refraining from production, acquisition, and proliferation of these weapons.

In the midst of sweeping popular support for Egypt's official position on extending the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty [sic], the "National Conference on Nuclear Risks and the Future of the Nonproliferation Treaty" was convened in the meeting hall of al-Ahram's new building. It was organized by the Egyptian Bajwash [not further identified; transliterated as in text; alternative spellings are Bagwash or Pajwash or Pagwash] group and the Afro-Asiatic Peoples Solidarity Organization [English title of group not verified] in cooperation with the al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies.

Support for the Egyptian Negotiator

Over a period of six hours, the conference held five sessions, during which an elite group of politicians, university professors, military experts, and strategic researchers spoke. Participated in by a number of top intellectuals, journalists, and Egyptian and Arab diplomats, the discussions were lively and demonstrated the great interest in this sensitive and serious issue. The participants emphasized their strong support for the Egyptian negotiator and the efforts aimed at establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East, Africa, the Mediterranean, and elsewhere to promote nonproliferation of these weapons. They also rejected the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty's indefinite extension.

The opening session was chaired by former Health Minister Dr. Mahmud Mahfuz, who said, "I welcome you in a month of struggle, the struggle of the soul and the nuclear struggle we are in." Dr. 'Abd al-Mun'im Sa'id, head of the al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, spoke, emphasizing the importance of this meeting. He said, "We are facing an important issue for Egyptian and Arab national security that has engaged the public's attention. It is a major concern. The importance of this subject may have been the motivation behind this large gathering." Noting that the Taba issue was one of the major challenges that had faced Egypt, he said, "We now are facing an important challenge and a difficult balancing act." He expressed the hope that this meeting would play an important part in responding to Egyptian intellectuals and that it will be a means for proposing initiatives and suggestions regarding this important topic."

Dr. Mufid Shehab, president of Cairo University, speaking about the foundations of the Egyptian position on the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, said, "Egypt's concern with the issue of nuclear weapons in the region is not new or unexpected, nor does it have anything to do with political considerations or alleged intentions toward one

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

party or another Egypt was among the original nations who participated in debating the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty before it was submitted for signature in 1968. It was also among the first countries to sign it at that time. Whatever has been said from time to time about the motives for signing, it is a fact that Egypt agreed by acceding to the treaty to voluntarily renounce at that early date any nonpeaceful nuclear intentions. It had hoped that the same would be true for all the region's nations, especially Israel, who at that time was the only country in the region to possess nuclear capabilities. However, this did not happen, as Israel did not sign the treaty. It did not want its nuclear capability to be restricted. Years passed after the treaty was submitted for signature, and it became effective in 1970. There was no change in the nuclear situation in the Middle East region. It was apparent at that time that the treaty would result in the opposite of what it had been designed to do, as Egypt's and the Arab nations' agreement to restrict their nuclear capability was not accompanied by any pressure on Israel to agree to sign the treaty."

Dr. Shehab added that a few years later came the next, more important step in Egypt's policy toward the region's nuclear problem. In 1974, Egypt and Iran submitted a proposal to establish a nuclear-free weapons zone in the Middle East. Iran subsequently abandoned its interest in the issue of ridding the region of nuclear weapons, leaving Egypt as the sole sponsor of this issue for many years. In this stage, Egypt wanted to make this concept a lasting one, so that the "Nuclear-Free-Weapons Zone" would be the primary scenario being proposed for dealing with this problem. Although Egypt was well aware of the difficulty associated with converting this idea into reality, not least through its own experience in dealing with the problem during the peace negotiations with Israel in the late 1970's, it insisted on emphasizing its positions about it, then on continuing to propose it, and finally on developing it to conform with the changing climate in the region. This has become clear in several matters, the most important of which are:

- Egypt's having ratified the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1981 to become a full party to it, in spite of a movement at that time warning about taking this step with Israel remaining outside the treaty;

%Egypt's having worked during the 1980's for the UN General Assembly to issue the annual resolution about establishing a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East to become a major international document since that time;

%Egypt's having further developed its concepts about the Middle East in 1990 toward the goal of ridding the region of weapons of mass destruction—the Mubarak initiative—when Iraqi president Saddam Husayn threatened to use chemical weapons.

Israel's Alleged Fears

Dr. Mufid Shehab indicated that the Egyptian position on the atomic weapons issue took on a new dimension when the process of finding a peaceful settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict began. Israel was alleging during the 1970's that ridding the region of nuclear weapons should be done through direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict. It was also claiming that the negotiations should include all direct parties to the conflict, in addition to stating its alleged fears of Libyan and Iraqi nuclear activities. The circumstances were very propitious when the peace process began in 1991 for several reasons. Among them was that the peace process was based on direct negotiations between the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, whether on the level of bilateral or multilateral negotiations, and that all direct parties to the conflict joined the peace process without exception. It was evident that Libya's nuclear aspirations had ended some years earlier and that Iraq's nuclear program had also ended through the international inspection operations.

He said, "The circumstances were conducive, therefore, to putting the nuclear problem on the table for negotiation. Egypt in fact called on Israel to inscribe it in the multilateral negotiations' agenda during the first round of the Arms Control and Regional Security committee, but Israel refused adamantly. Israeli officials indicated in the subsequent stage that they were agreeable to an understanding about the nuclear problem in the region, but only after the peace process became firmly established. Because the peace process had not stabilized after 1992, Egypt chose not to focus wholly on this issue, although it continued to bring it up as an enduring Egyptian policy line. When the issue of signing the chemical weapons treaty in 1992 was raised, the Egyptian position of 'linkage' emerged clearly, as Egypt refused to sign this treaty unless Israel signed the nuclear weapons treaty." Dr. Shehab stated that Egypt was not against the chemical weapons treaty; in fact, it participated in drafting it and emphasized in various ways that it would be committed to its contents, but it wanted to try to rectify matters that had become unbalanced many years ago.

Dr. Shehab concluded his talk by saying, "Peace in the Middle East has arrived at a stage in which it is necessary to tackle the problem of Israel's nuclear weapons, as this is a fundamental issue. As for the issue of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, it is a step that

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

was preceded by other steps and will be followed by even more."

The Danger's Strategic Dimensions

Military expert Maj. Gen. Ahmad 'Abd al-Halim spoke in the first session, chaired by former National Security Adviser Mr. Muhammad Hafez Isma'il. Dealing with the subject of "the strategic dimensions of the nuclear dangers in the region and their effects on the future of peace and regional security," he indicated that the importance of the Israeli military force lies in its possession of various elements of force, such as the spy satellite program, the antimissile missiles, and other advanced weapons, making it a power to be concerned about. He also noted that Israel was considered a regional nuclear force of a special type, as highly credible reports had indicated since 1986 that it possesses no less than 200 nuclear warheads. He said, "Israel's traditional force is extremely dangerous," and added that Israel is the only state in the world that is pursuing an offensive force.

He said, "Egypt did not raise the issue of Israel's nuclear arsenal when the 1989 Camp David accord was signed, because the treaty between Egypt and Israel was a bilateral treaty and Israel's arsenal at that time was believed to have few warheads." He added that the situation is different now and there is a comprehensive treaty that will decide the size of the arms. He noted that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty has five major elements that we must move toward. Among them is one prohibiting nuclear weapons and providing for guarantees through international assurances. He stated that an Arab nation by itself would not be able to produce anything equivalent to the Israeli nuclear force; it would have to be Arab nations working together. He said, "Israel's continuing to stand alone on the nuclear issue will lead to an imposed peace," adding that a defensive deterrent requires no more than a few nuclear warheads.

Israel's Nuclear Intentions

Muhammad 'Abd al-Sallam, a researcher at the al-Ahram newspaper's Center for Political and Strategic Studies, focused in his paper on responding to a particular question: Can there be true regional security in the region if there are nuclear weapons in it? He said, "One of the major goals of the process toward a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is creating a more secure strategic environment that is less conducive to producing political and psychological elements of instability."

He noted that the Middle East region is witnessing the relationships of an unbalanced nuclear power, as a single nation, Israel, that alone possesses nuclear weapons, is confronting nonnuclear nations, none of whom are on the threshold of becoming nuclear following the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear program. Therefore, the region is witnessing a situation in which there are "unrestrained nuclear weapons," with no precise rules for their use. He also indicated that the size of Israel's nuclear arsenal raises various issues, including the issue of what is enough. According to the estimates of the Israeli academician Shay Feldman [name as published], Israel has between 30 and 40 strategic nuclear bombs with between 20 and 60 kilotons of power, enough to destroy all of Israel's presumed targets in Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Libya, and Saudi Arabia and send these countries back into the Middle Ages. Thus, Israel's possessing considerably more than it needs raises many issues, the most important of which is "Israel's nuclear intentions." The final deterrent does not require more than a small number of strategic warheads.

Muhammad 'Abd al-Sallam said, "Credible reports indicate that Israel has several types of nuclear warheads, including 20- and 10-kiloton atom bombs, 200-kiloton hydrogen bombs, tactical weapons, artillery rocket warheads, and possibly nuclear mines." He added that this provokes various questions, as the multiplicity of types of nuclear warheads gives Israel options for their use that go well beyond final deterrence. The Samson option is not the only choice available to Israel. In addition, the existence of these different types might in moments of pressure give some of Israel's leaders worrisome ideas about actual offensive, combat uses of nuclear weapons. There are those who believe that this has already happened. Furthermore, the existence of these various small-caliber nuclear warheads, in particular, puts the concept of Israel's "nuclear security line" in question.

The paper presented by Ahmad al-Najjar, a researcher at the AL-AHRAM newspaper's Center for Strategic and Political Studies focused on the fact that normal and preferential economic cooperation between nations that have entered into conflicts and wars with each other requires special political and strategic provisions, not economic ones. He noted that, with regard to the Arabs and Israel, these provisions are completion of the settlement, confidence-building, and acceptance of parity and strategic balance. He noted that the Arab boycott of Israel had resulted in losses estimated by the Israeli Chambers of Commerce Union at $45 billion, equal to about a third of the total foreign aid obtained by Israel from all sources since its founding, which reflects the importance to Israel of ending the Arab boycott.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Establishing Strategic Balance

He said that, if, despite all the wars Israel has mounted against the Arabs, it has still failed to enter the Arab markets with an annual revenue of an estimated $140 billion, then opening these markets to Israel and allowing its entrance into the Arab region's economy within the framework of normal or preferential relations requires confidence-building measures and establishment of strategic parity with the Arabs as a starting point. The first confidence-building measures would be signing the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and agreeing to the Egyptian president's initiative, which calls for ridding the region of weapons of mass destruction, primarily Israel's atomic weapons. It also requires completion of the peace settlement that will not be just or sustainable over the long haul unless it includes Israel's withdrawal to behind the confrontation lines before the June 1967 war. If Israel does not accept this, the Arab nations must insist on continuing their economic boycott and isolating it from the region's economy.

Nonaligned Efforts

In the second session, chaired by Dr. 'Abd al-Mun'im Sa'id, Dr. Fawzi Hammad, head of the Atomic Energy Agency, reviewed the roots of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the efforts of the Nonaligned nations for this treaty. He said that the idea of ending the use of nuclear weapons and working toward the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes was born immediately following the well-known use of the nuclear weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. From this grew the idea of preventing proliferation. Then he went into the UN General Assembly's resolutions of the 1950's about preventing nuclear proliferation, when the General Assembly charged the disarmament committee—composed of 18 nations, including Egypt—with drawing up the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. In 1965, the General Assembly again stated the importance of quickly concluding this agreement, and a committee was formed composed of 10 nations, including two nuclear nations, America and the Soviet Union, and eight other nations, including Egypt. It was able to produce this treaty in its current form.

Dr. Hammad pointed out that the Nonaligned nations were able to insert amendments in the treaty. They inserted the paragraph about holding conferences to review the treaty to confirm that the objectives found in its preamble and provisions were being implemented. Then they added an important paragraph stating that a conference would be held in 25 years to consider extending the treaty indefinitely, for a one-time period, or for specified periods. This would be done by a majority of the nations who were parties to the treaty. Meanwhile, the nuclear nations had wanted the treaty to be perpetual from the beginning; however, the development nations felt that there must be an intermediate step to evaluate the treaty's performance, especially since the nuclear nations' obligations under the treaty were not given a timetable.

He then reviewed what had been accomplished by this treaty, explaining that the nuclear nations had so far not been able to conclude a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing, although they had announced their intention to do so. It had previously been announced that this treaty would be drafted before the review and extension conference to be held in this coming April, but they had retreated from this and announced that the new date would be 1996 or 1997. He noted that the nonnuclear nations had requested positive assurances in case they were threatened or subjected to attack by nuclear nations, but this had so far not been done.

He said, "The nuclear nations have not fulfilled their commitments to the nonnuclear nations to help with the requirements for use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. If we look at the use of reactors in providing electricity, we find that the developing world nations in Asia, Latin America, and southern Africa have only 6 per cent of the world's reactors for providing electricity. Thus, in the final estimate, from the point of view of the nonnuclear countries what has been accomplished through the treaty in the last quarter-century is small and does not justify agreeing to extending it indefinitely, especially since this treaty is hard to amend except by the nuclear nations. Extending it indefinitely would make it a treaty for all ages and give it the status of the holy books."

Dr. Hammad added that, in light of the changes in the world since the end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the beginning of limitations on nuclear weapons, the treaty's extension must be for short, specified periods and a timetable should be drawn up for gradually putting into effect the treaty's goals as regards halting production of fissionable elements and nuclear weapons, then reducing their inventory, and finally eliminating them. Included in this program should be the nuclear weapons in the Middle East, namely Israel. He noted that this conference is the first to be held for this purpose; if the treaty is extended indefinitely, the conference will not be held again and, thus, the Nonaligned nations or the nonnuclear nations would lose the tool that they had inserted in the treaty to monitor its progress and the extent of the commitment to implement its provisions.

Dr. Fawzi Hammad emphasized that the Egyptian position should be the seed of an Arab position and that

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

the Arab position should be part of the position of the Nonaligned nations, adding that it is the correct position for preventing nuclear proliferation. He said, "We have been very late in taking advantage of the fourth article. We must work to build a modern nation focusing on science, technology, and a strong economy, with nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, especially electricity and water purification, at its core."

Dr. Ahmad al-Rashidy, professor in Cairo University's economics faculty, spoke, saying that it was noteworthy that the treaty did not have any clear texts about the sanctions that could be imposed on violators of its provisions. He added, "The treaty includes a reference that could be important for us regarding the possibility for the Arab negotiator to insist that we will not enter the peace process unless Israel's position on this treaty is clarified." He said that the treaty referred to the ability of any state to withdraw, and this card could be used. He emphasized the need for us to insist on our position that the treaty should not be extended indefinitely.

Mr. Bahij Nassar, coordinator of the international campaign against nuclear weapons proliferation, rejected the treaty's indefinite extension, saying that a definite time period should be linked to a commitment offered by the countries to begin serious talks. He said, "The importance of this position is that we in the Middle East are trying to disarm Israel," adding, "We think that the extension should be for five; 10, or 15 years, according to the level of commitment to concluding a treaty to prevent the proliferation of atomic weapons." He said, "Our campaign is based on the idea that the conference should begin by discussing the review before making the decision to extend." He added, "We cannot separate our struggle against Israel's nuclear weapons from the international struggle," and noted that "we cannot succeed in imposing the peace that we want on Israel except by reaching Israeli public opinion." He emphasized that "it is not enough for us to discuss our opinions in closed rooms; rather there must be constant contact between Arab and international organizations to persuade them of our view before the conference."

Ambassador 'Umran al-Shafi'i, deputy assistant Foreign Minister, stated, "I represented Egypt in the United Nation's European headquarters in Geneva and also at the Conference on Disarmament, as well as being a member of the UN's advisory council for disarmament and international security issues. I say that eliminating nuclear weapons is an international goal and the Nonproliferation Treaty is one of its stages. Since the first calamity in which the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the international community has insisted on continuing to call for elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons. The international community has taken a step-by-step approach to this, as evidenced by treaties such as the partial ban on nuclear testing, the agreement on establishment of nuclear-free zones, and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which accepted the existence of only five nuclear nations with the aim of working on eliminating nuclear weapons within a general and comprehensive disarmament program under practical supervision."

Despite the end of the cold war and the disappearance of the world's polarization into two competing camps, which led to a decrease in tension, the international community has continued to call for nuclear disarmament, as seen in the call for a total halt to nuclear testing. In addition, the United States and the former Soviet Union arrived at a number of agreements that are working on ending the nuclear and traditional arms race. Moreover, the World Health Organization has requested an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice regarding the legality of the threat to use nuclear weapons. Last year, a group of nonaligned states also put forth the same initiative by directing a question to the International Court of Justice about whether the use of nuclear weapons or the threat of them under any circumstances is permitted by international law. This was part of the continual efforts to tighten the noose around the destructiveness of nuclear weapons. If the Court issues a positive opinion on both of these questions, this will work to shake up the nuclear policies of the governments that possess atomic weapons in the eyes of their people, these people who have emphasized through their nongovernmental organizations that the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons is not only illegal and illegitimate, but also immoral.

Ambassador 'Umran al-Shafi'i added that "the real concern that we feel about Israel's possession of nuclear weapons is shared by the world. It must also be considered that Israel alone has this weapon and its lack of accession to the Nonproliferation Treaty and its nonacceptance of inspections of its nuclear installations must be dealt with within the framework of international disarmament efforts as a whole. Finally, our handling of Israel's possession of nuclear weapons must be within the general international framework of eliminating these weapons, and all regional and international mechanisms must remain open to the Arabs and the Israelis in order to arrive at the goal of eliminating the nuclear menace from the region."

Egypt's Best Option

In the third session, chaired by Dr. Muhammad 'Abd al-'Ilah, chairman of the People's Assembly foreign relations committee, Dr. 'Issam al-Din Jalal spoke about Egypt's options and the Arab situation. Referring

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

to the option of leaving the situation as it was, he said that this choice is not workable because the circumstances of peace have changed. He added that the principal obstacle with regard to the region's security is the Israeli military creed that continues to be based on illegal seizure, expansionism, and restricting the Arabs' potential. He stated that as long as the Israeli military creed continues this way, it is foolhardy to speak of normalization and committing to a position on the treaty, because it is foolish to talk about a voluntary Israeli concession in this regard.

He noted that the option of withdrawing is a legal and legitimate one and that Egypt has excuses to withdraw as a result of incidents that have endangered its national security. He called on Egypt to make its commitment to the treaty conditional on the Security Council and the major parties to the treaty eliminating the risk to which its most important interests are being exposed. He stated that this, in his opinion, is Egypt's best option.

In the fourth session, chaired by former Foreign Minister Dr. Murad Ghaleb, Brig. Gen. Murad al-Dasuqy spoke about Israel's nuclear policy. He said that this policy continues to be extremely vague, adding that Israel has a dilemma. If it announces that it will join the treaty, this will result in an inspection that will expose it as a liar. He noted that there is a dispute within Israeli society about its nuclear policy and further indicated that Israel has not specified the parties to the peace that it is calling for. It wants to involve Iran in the process, and there are those who think Pakistan should be involved. He also dealt with Israel's options for use of nuclear weapons and the extent of the Israeli threat to Egyptian and Arab national security.

Dr. Ridha al-'Adl, head of 'Ayn Shams University's Middle East research center, talked about the history of Israel's nuclear policy and the strategic objectives that these policies [plural in text] employ. These include making the greatest possible gains in the present peace process and hinting at using it to serve any of Israel's national objectives. He said that the policy here is flexible and serves various goals that cannot be achieved by other methods. It is among the sources of Israel's power, he noted, adding that it has become a matter of urgency to establish Egyptian study teams in Israeli nuclear policy and the time has come for the world as a whole to rid itself of atomic weapons, as one of the remnants of the hysteria left over from World War II.

An Open Discussion and Profitable Dialogue

The concluding session was dedicated to an open discussion about the conference and an attempt to predict the future. Ahmad Sidqy al-Dajjany explained that Israel wants to remain the sole possessor of nuclear weapons in order to control the six dimensions of order in the Middle East. He emphasized that there is no substitute for collective security and that there is no room today for there to remain in our region one nation that possesses nuclear weapons.

Dr. 'Izzat 'Abd al-'Aziz, former chief of the Atomic Energy Agency, said, "There is a fact that we must pay attention to: We must act immediately and make the strategic decision to build Egyptian nuclear capabilities. In Egypt, we have a strong nuclear base, as we entered this field more than 35 years ago through the existence of the Atomic Energy Agency, the Nuclear Plants Agency, and the Nuclear Materials Agency [agency names as published]. This strong base qualifies us to decide immediately, through an order by President Mubarak, to decline to renew the treaty. Let us strive for Arab scientific nuclear integration. We must work toward building our nuclear capability in order to achieve Arab nuclear integration."

Ahmad Sharaf: "I advise the Egyptian government to link the Egyptian signature to the Israeli signature and to emphasize the nuclear risks of Israel's nuclear power. If Israel insists on not signing, Egypt should announce a policy of selling petroleum to Israel [sic, a negative was apparently dropped here], redeploying Egyptian forces to the outlying regions, including the Sinai, and halting all normalization measures in all fields, excepting only diplomacy. It should begin measures to enter the nuclear stage on the basis that this entry should be an Arab entry and within the framework of the Nonaligned nations."

Dr. Muhammad al-Sayyid Sa'id: "First of all, let us put aside the issue of nuclear parity, which could lead to extermination of the Palestinian people in the event of any nuclear exchange. An attempt to possess a nuclear weapon is an extremely expensive matter, and its economic cost is unjustifiable. Furthermore, the attempt by any Arab party to possess nuclear weapons would be an invitation to Israel to attack. Ignoring this possibility out of emotionalism is an invitation to ruin."

Dr. Murad Ghaleb: "North Korea's mere hinting at a withdrawal from the Nonproliferation Treaty subjected it to sanctions. Withdrawal is not easy. The issue is not only one of texts; it is bigger and deeper than that. America's problem is very serious, as Clinton is under the guillotine because of the upcoming elections. This is an extremely delicate stage and Jewish votes are very important."

Bahij Nassar: "American is concerned about Egypt's position because its status is linked to the Nonproliferation Treaty, and the issue of nonproliferation is one of the foundations of American policy. Fifty-four nations have decided to vote for the indefinite extension, and

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

American has only to obtain the agreement of 19 more countries."

Ambassador 'Umran al-Shafi'i: "The door to amendment is not closed. When we get to an article that is not being enforced, we can consider protocols. This will not provoke the nuclear nations when they are dealing with some of the articles. Great discretion and a policy are required."

Dr. 'Issam al-Din Jallal: "Korea has not yet and will not submit until it gets what it wants. We must assess the cost of not giving in. I oppose Egypt's choosing of its own will to enter a military nuclear race. We must announce to the world that we will not wager our future on this kind of imbalance. Each society has a will and a choice, and each choice has a price. Can we accept this price or not? The 1973 war was risky; we accepted the price because there was no alternative."

The writer Salah al-Din Hafez: "I agree with Dr. Murad Ghaleb and Dr. 'Issam al-Din Jallal that this seminar must be open to organized Arab action on this issue. First of all, I ask how Israel became the world's sixth nuclear power. It is true that Jewish money and scientists were the pillar of this; however, there is a more important issue and that is that since the founding of Israel the Israeli military creed has crystallized in an extremely clear way. There was in Israel a politico-security view that determined the risks and took shape in the political will from the end of the 1948 war until the present time. It was focused on dependence on military superiority as the core of superiority; the heart of this superiority is the possession of nuclear weapons, taking advantage of America and South Africa. We had a nuclear program and then renounced it at the first pressure we experienced. Do we now have a definite political will on the issue of nuclear weapons? The task of the research centers is to assist in forming the political will, and this is the responsibility of society as a whole. I have heard that the nuclear race is very costly, but, if we look at the traditional arms race, this might be even more expensive. Since the end of Desert Storm, for example, the Arab nations have spent $63 billion to purchase traditional weapons from the West. This is a frightening amount. Another point is that Israel insists on retaining its nuclear weapons, not only as a military deterrent, but also as a psychological deterrent. I believe that the perception that Israel is the sole possessor of nuclear weapons in the region is psychologically humiliating to us as Arabs, even more so than its military and political hegemony."

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Gulf Affairs

Alleged Extremist Plans To Destabilize Gulf

95LH0104A Paris AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI in Arabic 10 Feb 95 pp 14-16

[Article by Walid Abu-Zahr]

[FBIS Translated Text] Last April, a Western security "mission" arrived in Beirut on a top-secret mission to monitor the movements of extremist, fundamentalist groups and groups and organizations opposed to the peace process and to investigate the activities of international organizations linked to international terrorism—including the Japanese Red Army, the Armenian Secret Army, and the Kurdistan Workers' Party—that had reportedly gathered in Lebanon. During that period, the Western security "mission" was surprised by a report that intensive meetings were being held in a southern suburb of Beirut for fundamentalist, Islamic movements that have so far remained virtually unknown. Participants in these meetings, which were held in Bi'r al-'Abd Quarter, included representatives of the Iraqi Da'wah Party and the Islamic Front for the Liberation of Bahrain, as well as Kuwaiti, Qatari, and other Gulf fundamentalist figures, who met in the presence of Hizballah leaders, an official of Iran's "Office of Liberation Movements," and a senior officer of Iran's Republican Guard.

These periodic meetings, which aroused the concern of more than one security agency operating in Lebanon, were closely monitored to determine the hidden reasons behind the activation of Gulf fundamentalist movements.

Within a few months, intelligence agencies tasked with countering international terrorism were able to fully coordinate between a number of countries to collect information confirming the existence of an organized, ramified, Gulf fundamentalist network that is striving to export the "Islamic revolution" to the Gulf region, plan a series of operations to destabilize the Gulf governments, and form secret, domestic cells tasked with fomenting disturbances and unrest and exploding domestic situations at the first opportunity.

The latest report reaching a number of Gulf countries indicates the existence of a carefully thought out, coordinated fundamentalist plan for the Gulf countries, which have so far escaped "fundamentalist terrorism." The report speaks of: the existence of direct relations between the fundamentalist network that was dismantled some months ago in the Sultanate of Oman and the recent events in Bahrain; suspicious, quiet actions occurring in Kuwait; extremist groups that have attempted to act in Saudi Arabia; and suspicious, fundamentalist actions being undertaken in other Gulf countries.

Reports on the activities of extremist fundamentalists in the Gulf agree that Tehran is making a primary effort to destabilize the Arab Gulf states by drawing toward it extremist fundamentalists and giving them refuge and military, financial, and logistic support. Sources monitoring these movements disclose periodic visits to Iran by Gulf fundamentalist figures and stays in Iran by a number of them, e.g., 'Ali Salman—who incited the recent incidents in Bahrain and who studied at Qom University—and others.

Gulf extreme fundamentalists are apparently not going to Qom just to study. Many are also going to receive military training at a civil camp 100 kilometers south of Tehran, under the supervision of Iran's Republican Guard. AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI has information to the effect that a number of training courses have been held at said camp in which Gulf extremists have participated alongside fundamentalists from Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia, and Lebanon. These courses, which were supervised directly by Republican Guard commander Mohsen Kha'i and a security official named Sayfallah, led to the preparation of the nucleus of Gulf fighters that Iran has decided to establish.

The Gulf Battalion

According to AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI's information, Iran has formed a "political command" for Gulf fundamentalist movements. This command is composed of the chief opposition elements that have taken refuge in Iran, including the Iraqi Da'wah Party. However, in recent months, the focus has been on a "military nucleus." International terrorism experts state that a "Gulf Section" has recently been activated in Iran's "Office of Liberation Movements" (said office collaborates in the preparation of plans to export "the revolution and terrorism"). This "Gulf Section" has been tasked with implementing a plan to form a "Gulf Battalion" in the framework of the "Jerusalem Forces," the military arm for the "export of the revolution," which is responsible for all foreign operations.

The camps of Hizballah in Lebanon's Biqa' Valley, of al-Turabi in Khartoum's suburbs, and of Golboddin Hekmatyar near the Afghani-Pakistani border have been tasked with graduating classes to form the "Gulf Battalion." AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI has learned that "Gulf Afghanis" who previously fought the Soviets in Afghanistan and remained there after the holy war ended, have assumed the command of the Gulf Battalion and have participated in training its elements in cooperation with specialists from Hizballah, Iran's Republican Guard, and the Afghani Hezb-e Eslami [Islamic Party].

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Gulf reports state that Shaykh Usamah Ibn-Ladin, who has taken refuge in Sudan, has taken it upon himself to finance this battalion and is preparing to declare himself the "spiritual guide" of the Gulf fundamentalist movements. These reports add that Ibn-Ladin has convinced his friend, Yemeni fundamentalist leader Shaykh 'Abd-al-Majid al-Zandani, of the need to position elements of the Gulf Battalion in al-Zandani's camps in Yemen as a spearhead for deployment in Gulf countries when circumstances permit, or at least for the purpose of keeping them near the theater, so that they can provide logistic support, communications, and—along with the leaders located in London and Beirut—incitement.

In Lebanon, Gulf fundamentalist movements have apparently received more than just headquarters, fax machines, and forged passports. They have also received help in preparing armed groups able to wage guerrilla warfare, build car bombs, and employ various types of weapons and explosives. A security report states that fundamentalist elements from the Gulf have participated in a number of courses that graduate units specialized in naval operations, mines, and diving operations in a special camp for this purpose near the Orontes River. This report emphasizes that Gulf fundamentalists have begun to form secret cells in Beirut that are divided according to their countries of origin. This process began more than three months ago when the preparation of Gulf fundamentalists in Lebanon began to escalate. It has been noted that most of these Gulf fundamentalists arrive in Lebanon from Iran and several Arab and European countries in order to be assembled and mobilized on Lebanese territory to prepare plans of action for the next stage.

Observers believe that the Iranian regime is planning and sponsoring this scheme to destabilize the Arab Gulf countries. There is information to the effect that a decision to do so was made at the highest level with the approval of Islamic Revolution Leader 'Ali Khamene'i and the Supreme National Security Council and that Information Minister Hojjat ol-Eslam 'Ali Fallahian was tasked with coordinating the plan. However, official Tehran has been keen to distance itself from suspicions and from any appearance of being the primary inciter of disturbances in neighboring countries. It has thus striven to attribute any disturbances and problems that occur in any country to purely domestic factors. At worst, it directs attention to a domestic opposition acting quite removed from Iran. Some observers have noted that the regime of the mullahs has succeeded somewhat in "absolving" itself formally of the incidents in Bahrain's al-Budayyi' area. At first blush, it seems that Tehran is refraining from pouring oil on the fire: It has not incited the Iranian masses to demonstrate, which it might have done, if not to support the Shiah community in Bahrain, then at least to inflame the sore spot of "the 14th province" (some Iranians have claimed Bahrain as Iran's 14th province since the shah's days). However, these "diplomatic" appearances have not fooled experts and persons who are knowledgeable of the behind-the-scenes manipulation that fomented the incidents in Bahrain and that is steering the Gulf fundamentalist movements. Iranian connections to the inciters of the disturbances in the Shiite villages in Bahrain were more clear than the official position of Iran, which did not call for quiet so much as it laid the ground for subsequent steps, [which it would have taken] had Bahrain's political and security leaders not managed to contain and end the incidents, which they did with very few losses and more determination than expected by the Iranians.

In addition to 'Ali Salman having spent 12 years of his life in Qom, Bahrain's Interior Ministry has observed Iranian involvement in incidents on more than one occasion. The most salient is a recorded telephone conversation between one of the agitators and the person in Iran responsible for liaison with him. In this conversation, the agitator asks for "supplies of dynamite, because the Molotov bombs have not achieved the desired effect."

The disclosure of the role played in the incitement of the recent incidents in Bahrain by Bahraini fundamentalists residing in Beirut points an accusing finger at Tehran and Hizballah. Hizballah was the liaison for the formation of a unified command for Bahraini fundamentalists and then for Gulf fundamentalists in Beirut. Bahraini authorities are not ignorant of the activities and connections of the Secretary-General of the Islamic Front for the Liberation of Bahrain, Muhammad 'Ali al-Mahfuz, who took refuge in Lebanon more than 10 years ago. They are also aware of the key role being played by Shaykh Muhammad Husayn Fadlallah, Hizballah's spiritual leader, whose opinions most Gulf Shiites seek to follow.

Details of the Plan

In any case, it seems certain that the recent incidents in Bahrain were not without design. Nor were they motivated primarily by social demands. Rather, they were a part of a fundamentalist plan targeting the Gulf, which has focused, in its initial stage, on a small, sensitive country where extremist fundamentalists have managed to penetrate a number of charitable religious organizations and to attract a number of merchants and businessmen and some politicians so that they have come to possess an effective economic base.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

A Western security report states that the main details of the plan to export fundamentalist terror to the Gulf may have been formulated in a meeting held in al-'Imarat Quarter in Khartoum last October. That meeting was attended by Dr. Hasan al-Turabi, Shaykh Usamah Ibn-Ladin, Iranian Ayatollah 'Ali Jannati, a representative of Ayatollah Mohtashemi (the founder of the Lebanese Hizballah), and officials in branches of the Muslim Brotherhood who have pretended to forget their differences with al-Turabi and the extremist fundamentalist movements in a number of Gulf countries.

At that meeting, which was held a number of weeks after the Sultanate of Oman disbanded fundamentalist cells aiming to destabilize the country, it was decided to activate fundamentalist networks in the Gulf countries, reorganize them, and prepare them to jump off to a new stage in the "holy war." An agreement was reached to provide military training to some groups and to prepare sabotage plans. The International Organization of the Muslim Brotherhood, because it possesses branches in a number of Gulf countries and is considered the most able to act freely, was tasked with domestic mobilization in coordination with other extremist fundamentalist movements, which were assigned sabotage missions in the field.

According to this report, a list was prepared of those countries that have been subjected to the highest degree of penetration by extremist Islamic groups and that are considered the most susceptible to preliminary trouble-causing operations. The Western report states that the most suitable targets, in the Islamicists' view, are countries that are open to the West and relatively liberal or in which social factors can be exploited to justify extremist fundamentalist activities. The report speaks of a plan for targeting foreigners, which is grounded in the arguments of "morality and colonialism," to disrupt the targeted countries' relations with Western countries. Actually, a number of Western countries, whose agencies saw the report, hastened to issue instructions to their subjects that urged them to observe the customs and traditions prevailing in the Gulf countries, dress modestly, not violate the laws, and avoid moving in crowded areas.

At this point, Arab and Western agencies began to coordinate fully and exchange information regarding the activities of fundamentalist cells and elements, not just in the Gulf countries, but worldwide. According to AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI's information, extensive security coordination has been under way for some time between the Gulf Cooperation Council countries and other Arab and foreign countries concerned with terrorism. This coordination has resulted in the preparation of detailed lists of names of suspicious elements in each country and the names of businessmen known for their support of the activities of extremist fundamentalists and Islamic societies that engage in extremist activities and establish cells under the cover of charity work. Some businessmen have been confronted with copies of their generous contributions to suspicious, domestic, Islamic organizations, or financial transfers to charitable societies supervised by Shaykh Hasan al-Turabi, or transfers that they effected to extremist, Islamic movements in Europe through banks in Switzerland, Luxembourg, and Germany.

Abu-'Ammar

AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI has learned that Egyptian agencies and other agencies have collaborated in providing lists of names of Gulf personalities regarding whom there is proof that they provided funding to al-Jama'ah al-Islamiyah [the Islamic Group] in Egypt. The Egyptian authorities have also given several Gulf states the names of a number of Arab citizens residing in Egypt that appear on lists that were discovered by Egyptian authorities when they disbanded a brotherhood network known as the "Salsabil" [name of a spring in Paradise] organization. Among them is an Iraqi named "Abu-'Ammar." His real name is M. A. al-Rashid, and he is one of the most prominent "Arab Afghans" who fought in the holy war against communism before settling in a Gulf country on a mission to collect Gulf funds for Arab extremist fundamentalists.

Security information confirms that the mission of the extremist fundamentalist "Arab Afghans" in the Gulf has now gone beyond collecting funds to finance the activities of fundamentalist organizations in the Arab, Islamic, and Western countries. It is now focusing on domestic activity that targets the conditions and stability of the Gulf states.

Has Iran succeeded in using the Gulf fundamentalists to destabilize the Gulf countries in the same way that it is destabilizing other countries?

Security experts and political observers of fundamentalist extremism agree that it is doubtful whether the extremists will succeed in implementing their plan. Their doubt stems from a number of political, geostrategic, economic, social, and religious factors, explained to us by a French specialist in Middle Eastern affairs, international terrorism, and fundamentalist extremism. He states:

"1. The fundamentalists in the Gulf are still a minority. Moreover, the Gulf states became aware of the danger posed by fundamentalist extremism before it constrained them, and they have taken measures to confront and cut off this danger.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

"2. Demonstrations and petition-signing by people do not threaten state security. The latest indication comes from Bahrain. Bahrain determined how to deal with the incidents. It ended them without any negative repercussions, except for some property damage caused by agitators.

"3. The Gulf countries are not fertile ground for fundamentalist extremism. These countries do not suffer from any social or economic problems that would push toward the use of violence and religion as a form of opposition. On the contrary, the people in the Gulf live prosperous, flourishing lives. They are, therefore, motivated to build a strong dam against extremism, whose results they have seen in Algeria, Sudan, Afghanistan, and Iran. It is no coincidence that the notables of the Shiite villages that witnessed the recent incidents in Bahrain hastened to condemn and denounce what happened. Some people in the Gulf with fundamentalist tendencies are no doubt more desirous than others of refraining from causing tension in the situation, out of a desire to protect their wealth and interests.

"4. The Iranian game has become clear to everyone, citizens before rulers. Moreover, Iran is living in a glass house and will ultimately realize that it itself is endangered by the destabilization of the Gulf. It will discover that its policy of fleeing forward to export terrorism will not solve its problems and multifaceted crises.

"5. Because of the Gulf region's geostrategic importance to the entire world, its security and stability constitute an international 'red line.' If Iraqi President Saddam Husayn is not allowed to destabilize and threaten the security of the Gulf, extremist groups will certainly not be allowed to do so, especially since the movers of these organizations, from Iran to Sudan, are currently in the 'eye of the storm.'

"6. International counterterrorism coordination has reached an unprecedented level despite all of the criticisms that can be leveled against it. Believe me when I say that all leaders, financiers, camps, and even local elements of fundamentalist extremism have been identified. Within a few months, the Gulf countries have been able to conduct a comprehensive, detailed survey of suspicious elements, organizations, and societies. They have prepared a local, Gulf plan to counter this extremism. The results will appear shortly, whether in the domestic sphere or in Tehran, Khartoum, Beirut, and even London, which has started to witness discord between Gulf fundamentalist leaders over the dangers of linkage to Iran and suspicions regarding the foreign connections and funding sources of some 'oppositionists.'"

Kuwait

*Continuation of Sanctions Against Iraq Urged

95LH0101A London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 24 Feb 95 p 30

[Article by Hafiz Mahfuz]

[FBIS Translated Text] On the fourth anniversary of its liberation, personified by its amir, government, and people, Kuwait remembers its innocent martyrs who fell on her ground watering it with their scented blood as they were resisting the horrendous occupation, which they could have never imagined. Kuwait also remembers the wonderful support and collaboration she received from its brethren and friendly countries to repress the aggression and crush the terrible invasion plan. Foremost amongst the brethren countries that came to Kuwait's rescue were the Gulf Cooperation Council countries under the leadership of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It was only due to the historic courageous resolution of Saudi Arabia's Servant of the Two Holy Shrines, King Fahd Bin 'Abd-al-'Aziz, to ask for the deployment of the allied forces that the impact of the aggression, which started at dawn time on 2 August 1990, was contained by 26 February 1991. Had the aggression not been contained, the invaders might have expanded their invasion to other Gulf states and hence the map of the whole region would have been changed.

A positive development in Kuwait's favor characterizes the fourth anniversary: Iraq's official and documented recognition of its sovereignty and of its borders as delineated by the International Committee. However, the continued detainment of war prisoners and those detained in Iraqi prisons is still worrying Kuwaitis and will continue to do so until the fate of those people that the Iraqi forces led from their homes, from the streets, and from the mosques to Iraqi detention camps is revealed; these people were led because they hosted their country's flag and pictures of their amir and heir apparent, refused to have dealings with the occupiers, and affirmed their loyalty to their country and their affiliation with their fathers' and grandfathers' soil.

Though, presently, Baghdad is leading a diplomatic campaign for lifting the sanctions imposed on her, sanctions will not be lifted unless the Iraqi regime executes all international resolutions. Amongst these resolutions is either releasing the prisoners of war or disclosing their fate and giving compensations for losses caused by the invasion, which are estimated to be about $90 billion. The current regime is solely

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

responsible for the Iraqi people's human crisis because it is both the origin and the cause of the problem. Besides, the regime's faulty calculations have led to the impoverishment of its country and people and their international isolation.

On this anniversary, the Arab brethren and the sons of friendly peoples from both East and West are viewing the new Kuwait and are proudly registering her setting up the reconstruction workshop in a record time. They are also viewing Kuwait's regaining of her spectacular civilization and the brilliant role she plays at the regional, Arab, Islamic, and international levels. Those friendly people are also greatly admiring the intensive liberty that Kuwaitis enjoy in voicing their opinion and criticism as well as in practicing open democracy by way of the People's House, journalism, executives, and seminars. This liberty was highly exemplified last week when Kuwaiti writers criticized the Cabinet's resolution to apply paragraph 3 of article 35 of the Civil Service Law, which prohibits combining a civil service job with any other job, including that of journalism.

The liberation as well as the national feast anniversary teaches Kuwaiti people a lot of lessons and points to them precautionary warnings. The painful and terrible crisis that the Kuwaiti people went through created new and different people. This crisis also taught them that their faith in Kuwait and in their national unity is the main safeguard and salvation tool in the face of all challenges and dangers. It also taught them that whatever difficulties they might face, their rallying around their legitimate leadership lights for them the road to the future. This is so, because the first sparkle of light that penetrated the long darkness originated from resisting the occupation and noncollaborating with it. Besides, affirming allegiance to the country, her leadership, and emblems paved the way to the success of the liberation operation. The country's legitimate leadership also resorted to its second motherland, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to the Saudi leadership to re-enforce the liberation operation. The Saudi leadership provided all the potentialities and made possible all the means for the true coming of the liberation dream and the abortion of the invasion plan. Saudi Arabia, together with her sister Gulf countries, acted as host to Kuwaitis until God blessed them with liberty and they, with high pride and complete self-esteem, returned to their motherland.

If national and family unity was intensely exemplified and all the Kuwaiti people, inside and outside Kuwait, rallied around their legitimate leadership during the occupation period, there is more reason at the present time to re-enforce and deepen this unity within the Kuwaiti society. Kuwaitis should remember that the invasion did not differentiate between Kuwaitis; it did not also classify Kuwaitis. In fact, the occupation soldiers would either fire at a person or lead him to the nearest detention camp to be relentlessly tortured without any consideration for his family or ethnic affiliation once that person hoisted his country's flag or the amir's picture or chanted his country's name.

The postliberation period does not tolerate those Kuwaitis who might indulge in classifying Kuwaiti citizens according to their ethnic affiliation: e.g., into Sunnis and Shi'ites. The experiences of other nearby and far-off countries that were domestically devastated by ethnicity and where ethnicity has created crises that these countries cannot yet overcome should be a warning to those Kuwaitis.

Any differentiation between Kuwaitis can be only made by virtue of how much a Kuwaiti serves his/her country and society. Similarly, a Kuwaiti can be only classified by virtue of his/her contribution to his/her country, not merely by the satisfaction they may get from enjoying their country's bounties. Kuwaitis should be the most appreciative people of the blessing of both having a motherland and belonging to that motherland because they met with an experience that mostly robbed them of this blessing: a blessing above all other blessings. Kuwaitis should also be appreciative of this blessing because they learned—the practical way—that the protection of sovereignty and independence is much more important than having these blessings, then exposing them to be lost.

Within the basics of democracy in modern societies, the evolvement of a plurality of thoughts and stands and the existence of differences and conflicts of opinions are normal phenomena. However, for the nation's sake, all powers should be under control in the framework of cooperation and complementation. Meanwhile, it is very grave to allow this plurality to go beyond a responsible, mature, and wise dialogue. In case plurality surpasses this responsible dialogue, it could be likened to a train that becomes derailed from its way to safety; consequently, democracy would become unable to confront any tough obstacles.

All of those who supported Kuwait during her crisis—Arabs and non-Arabs—believe that, though Kuwaitis may have used different methods in pursuing their political and national activities as well as in their public service, they all had one common goal: preserving Kuwait as a nation for all of her citizens and protecting her from all evil in order for her to remain a precious heritage for future generations. This should be the foremost duty of all Kuwaitis and particularly the combined duty of the government and the House. The

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

combined duty could be achieved by way of creating a positive and effective cooperation that serves only Kuwait's interests, which are the only true and fixed interests for all Kuwaitis as quoted by their Amir Shayhk Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah. The amir's long political expertise, his known wisdom and prudence have become a dagger confronting Kuwait's foes; this dagger protects Kuwait from the evils brought about by crises and lets her emerge successful after facing the most difficult tests and the hardest challenges.

Oman

*Sultan Qabus Promotes Private Sector Economics

95LH0105A Paris AL-WATAN AL'ARABI in Arabic 10 Feb 95 pp 12-13

[FBIS Translated Text] The annual inspection excursion which Sultan Qabus Bin-Sa'id, the Sultan of Oman, undertakes to the various provinces of the sultanate is considered to be a unique example of discerning political performance which has become an integral part of the management structure and style of government. In the course of twenty five years in the history of the modern Omani state, this arrangement has, year in year out, made the meeting and debate between the Sultan and his people possible. The Omani citizen, wherever he may be in the sultanate, has come to expect this important national event and look forward to it at the beginning of every year. Ultimately, these excursions have become a permanent fixture of the Omani political scene that highlights the interaction of the citizen with his top political leadership, as well as his participation in the effort for comprehensive development.

This year, the sessions of Oman's open parliament were conducted during his twenty fifth excursion beginning when the Sultan's procession progressed from Musqat province 7 January and ending in Salalah, the capital of Dhofar province on the evening of 31 January, passing through the provinces and departments of the inland and central regions and Dhofar province.

The Omani people in those regions, men, women, seniors and children, came out at the break of dawn to express their deep devotion and sincere support for the leader of their cause, displaying slogans, bearing flowers, raising the picture of the Sultan and wishing him long life.

At his meetings with the seniors, notables and inhabitants of these regions, Sultan Qabus focused on several important topics and points that are linked to the political, economic security and social circumstances of the sultanate. He affirmed that development in all spheres is progressing according to set plans, available capabilities and population density. He indicated that development pathways have reached every corner of the sultanate even distant, outlying and border areas. He made it clear that there was no justification for the demand for expansion in barren desert areas that lack water and where there was no human habitation and where conditions that would dictate a decision to proceed with development are absent. Expansion in those areas would be no more than a loss of effort and money.

During his conversations, Sultan Qabus touched upon the labor force of the sultanate, national and imported. He mentioned that imported labor is up to half a million visitors. More than a quarter of a million of them do not have permanent work, having entered the country through the sponsorship of Omani citizens. This is in comparison to 30 thousand Omanis needing work, but demanding high salaries.

Qabus said that the government wanted every Omani to be able to find work that would suit him. He asked employers to tap the national work force for their job requirements instead of hiring newcomers. He urged Omani youth to be responsible and to feel responsibility for itself and for its country.

Sultan Qabus denied the existence of real unemployment, describing this situation as one of contrived unemployment because the employment market in the sultanate supported many times this number and accommodated all Omanis. However they were not satisfied with the salaries that were offered to them or they considered the job offers to be unsuitable for them.

He affirmed that in its economic policy, the sultanate did not improvise, but based itself on sound and studied planning, economic benefit and necessity, pointing out that the matter was not one of bragging or boasting. It was conducted according standards, principles and rules. It was subject to precise studies and in accordance with the demands of time, necessity and benefit.

Sultan Qabus touched upon the private sector indicating that this sector now represented the economic foundation for all countries. By reason of its capacity for endurance and competition, it secured the solid foundation for the government and the citizenry. Furthermore, the Islamic religion respected individual ownership and urged human beings to strive and work. Hence, the Omani government was working to strengthen and support the private sector and to ease all the measures that are linked to investment projects in order to benefit the citizenry, spread the benefit to everyone and strengthen the national economy.

Qabus spoke about the livestock wealth in the sultanate and the means of exploiting it. He said that he had

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

solicited intensely for the formation production and marketing companies to enable them to exploit and market meats, leather, dairy and their by-products. He added that by paying attention to this wealth, the Omani government aimed at attaining self-sufficiency in all aspects of livestock production. He affirmed that the government would grant every assistance to production and animal husbandry projects on the same level as the industrial sector.

Regarding the general budget, he said that the government would attempt to avoid a budget deficit during the coming five year plan (1996/2000). Revenues and spending would be balanced so as to preserve continually, and at its high standard, the sultanate's good credit rating in economic circles.

There was general agreement to confer the expression "Oman's open parliament" to these annual excursions which are akin to a mobile consultative assembly through which the debate and consultation between Sultan Qabus and the citizenry are conducted in a stable cultured manner that links the ruler to the subject without prior or defined ceremony or protocols. He listens to them, becomes privy to their situation, learns their demands and orders to solve their problems.

Sultan Qabus is careful to undertake these excursions annually, keeping to his schedule no matter the circumstances. He drives his car for hundreds of kilometers himself.

These excursions have their own characteristics and repercussions. The most important is the transport of the executive authorities like ministers, consultants and officials in all areas and specializations to various spots so that they could listen to the citizens' problems and become acquainted with their difficulties and concerns and work to meet their demands and execute them, as well as to study their problems and respond to them.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Delegate: NPT Extension Fails To Dispel 'Fears'

JN1205081695 Baghdad INA in Arabic
0730 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The United Nations, 12 May (INA)—Iraq has asserted that the indefinite extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] has placed obstacles in the way of the efforts to render the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons.

In a speech delivered yesterday evening, Wisam al-Zahawi, head of the Iraqi delegation to the conference, said that the indefinite extension of the NPT has also failed to dispel the fears of nonnuclear powers.

Ambassador Wisam al-Zahawi added that if the indefinite extension of the NPT had been put to the vote, Iraq would have voted against the extension.

Al-Zahawi explained that the Zionist entity is the only Middle Eastern country that has clandestinely and illegally produced nuclear weapons. Nonetheless, this entity enjoys protection against the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 487 of 1981, which demands that Israel open its nuclear installations for international inspection, al-Zahawi argued.

Reportage on Foreign Minister's Meetings at UN

Greets NAM's UN Envoys

JN1105180495 Baghdad INA in Arabic
1705 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] New York, 11 May (INA) — Foreign Minister Muhammad Sa'id al-Sahhaf met in New York this morning with the ambassadors of the six Non-Aligned Movement's [NAM] member states at the UN Security Council.

Following the meeting, the foreign minister told journalists that he explained in detail to the NAM ambassadors Iraq's stand on UN Security Council Resolution No. 986. He said a number of ideas about the next step after Iraq's categorical rejection were discussed.

The meeting was attended by Ambassador Nizar Hamdun, Iraq's permanent representative to the United Nations, and Dr. 'Abd-al-Amir al-Anbari, Iraq's permanent UNESCO representative. The NAM group at the United Nations comprises Oman, Nigeria, Indonesia, Rwanda, Botswana, and Honduras.

Meets Argentine UN Envoy

JN1105190995 Baghdad INA in Arabic
1744 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] New York, 11 May (INA) — Foreign Minister Muhammad Sa'id al-Sahhaf met in New York this morning with Ambassador Emilio Cardenas, Argentina's permanent UN representative and member of the UN Security Council. During the meeting, the foreign minister reviewed Iraq's stand on Resolution 986 and its articles, which violate Iraq's sovereignty, political independence, and territorial integrity. He indicated the terms set by that resolution have made it impossible for Iraq to accept it or deal with it.

Muhammad Sa'id al-Sahhaf explained that competent Iraqi authorities, the representatives of the people at the National Assembly and the Autonomous Region's Legislative and Executive Councils, trade unions, federations, and people's councils throughout Iraq thoroughly studied Resolution 986 and reached the conclusion that the resolution places shackles on Iraq's future and violates its territory. Consequently, he said, the resolution cannot be accepted and it has been decided to reject it.

A source at the Iraqi delegation told INA the foreign minister's visit to the United Nations is part of Iraq's continued positive cooperation with the UN Security Council and the Special Commission to implement Paragraph 22 of Resolution 687 providing for lifting the economic blockade of Iraq.

Meets Chinese Deputy UN Representative

JN1105192895 Baghdad INA in Arabic
1800 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] New York, 11 May (INA) — Foreign Minister Muhammad Sa'id al-Sahhaf met with Ambassador Wang Zuxian [name as transliterated], China's deputy permanent UN representative.

During the meeting, the foreign minister expressed Iraq's appreciation for China's stands calling for lifting the embargo imposed on Iraq. He also explained to Ambassador Wang in detail the reasons behind Iraq's rejection of Resolution 986.

Iraqi delegation sources told INA that all the ambassadors with whom the foreign minister met today stressed their countries' support for Iraq's sovereignty and territorial integrity and unity.

Further on Meetings With Envoys

JN1205080195 Baghdad INA in Arabic
0725 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] United Nations, 12 May (INA) — Foreign Minister Muhammad Sa'id al-Sahhaf held a series of meetings in New York yesterday with several ambassadors of the permanent members in the Security Council.

The foreign minister met with Nugroho Wisnu Murti, Indonesia's permanent UN representative; Ambassador

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Salim Bin-Muhammad al- Khusaybi, permanent representative of the Sultanate of Oman; and Ambassador Gerhard Walterheins [name as transliterated], deputy to Germany's permanent ambassador.

During these meetings, al-Sahhaf underscored Iraq's rejection of Resolution 986. He briefed the ambassadors separately on some ideas about future steps, especially the implementation of Paragraph 22 of Resolution 678, which calls for lifting the economic blockade.

'Regime' Said To Have Executed 35 Army Officers

NC1105173595 (Clandestine) Voice of the People of Kurdistan in Arabic 1500 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Citing the NIDA' AL-RAFIDAYN weekly, the 10 May issue of KURDISTAN NWAY said the 'Aflaqite regime recently executed 15 military officers stationed in (Bani Maqam) in Chamchamal District. This was on the eve of the heroic operations carried out east of Karkuk city by the Kurdistan peshmerga and the Iraqi National Congress forces.

The paper also reported that, since the beginning of May, the Iraqi regime executed 35 other officers from the Dulaym and al-Jubur tribes on charges of opposing the regime. The paper added that four senior officers managed to enter the al-Musayyab military assembly compound and transported four truckloads of weapons and ammunition to an unknown destination.

Attack on Government Security Forces Reported

NC1105165495 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi Islamic Revolution in Arabic 1430 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] A group of Islamic resistance forces carried out an attack on the official in charge of the emergency security unit in al-Samawah in southern Iraq on 20 April.

According to our sources, Major Fawzi 'Ali al-Samarra'i and his three bodyguards were killed in the attack and the vehicle in which they were riding was destroyed.

Our sources said that after the operation, the regime's henchmen placed all the city's party and security apparatuses on alert. The government established a strict security cordon around the city and special units of the emergency and security forces and intelligence agencies raided and searched houses in the area of attack and arrested dozens of citizens.

Our sources added that the regime's henchmen and officials of the security and party apparatuses in al-Samawah changed their places of residence and employed dozens of bodyguards to protect them from likely attacks by resistance heroes.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Rabin Defends Land Expropriations in Jerusalem

TA1205100695 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 12 May 95 p 3

[Report by Menahem Rahat]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin yesterday said that "the land expropriations in Jerusalem were not designed to usurp anyone's property, but rather to turn uncultivated areas into construction projects for both Arabs and Jews." [passage omitted]

Rabin revealed that 70 percent of the land on Har Homa was owned by Jews. "If we need to add another 300 dunams to the Ramot neighborhood, which is growing all the time, then such needs justify expropriation in exchange for full compensation and the right of appeal to the courts through legal channels. As for the area between Gilo and Malha, we need 200 dunams to relocate the police headquarters from the Russian Compound and build 400 housing units for East Jerusalem Arabs."

The prime minister stressed that the present government stopped what it described as the intrusion into the village of Silwan, out of "respect for a minority which wants to live with us in peace." It was the present government, Rabin added, which "put a halt to the maneuvers employed by 'Ataret Kohanim in an attempt to infiltrate the Muslim Quarter under various pretexts."

Meanwhile, at a meeting of the Likud's political bureau yesterday, Chairman Binyamin Netanyahu called on the prime minister to publicly welcome the relocating of the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. "On this issue," Netanyahu said, "all members of the Zionist factions in the Knesset are in agreement." [passage omitted]

Rabin Denies U.S. Made Offers on Syria Talks

TA1105170495 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1505 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Israel and Syria disagree on almost every issue, Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin said today. At the same time, he believes that the officers' talks will resume at the end of June. Our correspondent Pe'erli Shahar listened to the prime minister:

[Begin recording] [Rabin] There are disagreements on almost all of the issues that need to be agreed on if we wish to attain a peace contract. The question, naturally, is how to continue the negotiations. We explained our terms for the pursuit of the negotiations on security arrangements. I believe that so far I have not received a clear answer from the Americans on when and in what shape they will be held. I was told that Syrian Foreign Minister al-Shar' will be arriving in Washington on 15 May. The Americans believe that, after U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher visits the area at the end of May or the beginning of June, the talks between the Israeli and Syrian military men will perhaps resume by the end of June. This, however, is only speculation. If Syria has time, we have time too.

[Shahar] Rabin stressed that in his conversation with U.S. President Bill Clinton it was agreed that the United States will not present its own bridging offers.

[Rabin] Because one of the central things is that there will be no American paper. The Americans may mediate between us and the Syrians — just as they did before the Madrid conference between us and the Arab world when they came up with an agreed-on letter of invitation.

[Shahar] Israel will welcome any decision by a foreign government to move its embassy to Jerusalem, Rabin stated once again today. The controversy over this does not impair the negotiations with the Palestinians, he said.

[Rabin] In 1967, a government under Levi Eshkol decided on the unification of Jerusalem under Israeli law and rule. True, no foreign government has since recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital or as the united city of Jerusalem. It will make us happy if they do but, as far as we are concerned, whether they recognize this or not, Jerusalem is united and under Israeli sovereignty. We welcome any recognition or transfer of embassies. [end recording]

[Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew at 1400 GMT on 11 May reports: "Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin welcomed the fact that 'Arafat is prepared to pursue the negotiations in spite of the expropriation of land in Jerusalem."]

Rabin: Iranian Threat Persists; U.S. Efforts Fail

TA1205100895 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 12 May 95 pp 1, 2

[Report by David Lipkin]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin yesterday warned that "hundreds of experts from Russia and China, who can smell hundreds of millions of dollars, will help Iran gain the technological know-how to convert its nuclear reactors for military use."

Rabin, who was speaking at a seminar organized by MA'ARIV, said that the danger persists. This, after President Bill Clinton, although successful in preventing the sale of equipment used to enrich uranium for military purposes, had failed to persuade Russian President Boris Yeltsin to refrain from selling nuclear reactors to Iran. "If Clinton was unsuccessful," Rabin said, "it is extremely doubtful whether Israel can achieve any results." [passage omitted]

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Peres: 'No Reason Whatsoever' To Help Iran

TA1105113895 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1005 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Following the compromise that has been reached with regard to the renewal of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT], Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres said that Israel is not obligated to sign the NPT because of the Iranian threat, among other reasons. Foreign Minister Peres also commented on the deadlock in the negotiations with Syria and the Palestinians. Nisim Qeynan spoke with the foreign minister, who was touring Sederot.

[Begin recording] [Qeynan] There will be no change in Israel's position on signing the NPT, Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres asserted. Peres explained the reasons for Israel's stance and emphasized that the Iranian threat precluded any signing of the treaty.

[Peres] We do not intend to sign the NPT because there is a threat to Israel's very existence, a threat that stands totally in contravention to the UN Charter. This threat is spearheaded by Iran, which is calling for a halt to the peace process and for the destruction of the State of Israel. Iran is trying to achieve nuclear capability, and we see no reason whatsoever to facilitate the achievement of this option or to enhance the threat Iran poses to Israel.

[Qeynan] As for Syria, Minister Peres said that the weapons in its possession are becoming obsolete and that Damascus has run out of sources for replenishing its weapons stock. The natural choice for Syria is clear:

[Peres] What I said was that we are not negotiating with Syria because we fear a war but rather because we seek peace. It is totally stupid to make the residents of the Middle East pay a double price: first the price of war and then the price of peace. All this comes at the expense of our children, youth, and citizens. A great deal of money which could be invested in education and development is being spent to create metal instruments of hatred and violent confrontation. This is the basic idea.

[Qeynan] As for 'Arafat's demand that the negotiations be completed by the 1 July deadline, Foreign Minister Peres said Israel is making a supreme effort to meet this date but the Palestinians are insisting on many things and continued obduracy on their part will prevent both parties from meeting their target date.

[Peres] As for meeting this date, not everything depends entirely on us. The Palestinians are also insisting on a lot of things. For example, with regard to the issue of redeployment, if they continue to be stubborn, it will be very difficult to reach an agreement. Yasir 'Arafat forgets that there are two parties involved here. One party cannot set the date; only the two sides can do that.

[Qeynan] Minister Peres was speaking during a tour of Sederot. [end recording]

Rabin Issues Statement Rejecting Amnesty Report

TA1205083895 (Internet) Israel Information Service in English 11 May 95

["Prime Minister Rabin's response to Amnesty International's report; communicated by the prime minister's media adviser"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The following is Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin's response to Amnesty International:

Though the Government will soon issue a detailed response, we feel compelled to respond immediately to the unbalanced and inaccurate report on Israel by Amnesty International in its latest report.

The most glaring inaccuracy is the fact that Amnesty International defines Palestinian detainees as "prisoners of conscience and possible prisoners of conscience." As we have pointed out time and time again to Amnesty International, Israel does not arrest individuals for their beliefs and does not hold prisoners of conscience. Only those who are affiliated with illegal organizations which advocate and employ violence are subject to arrest. According to Amnesty's own definition, individuals who use or advocate violence cannot be considered prisoners of conscience.

Amnesty International has, as usual, totally ignored the realities of the situation. On the one hand, Israel is in the midst of negotiating a peace agreement with the Palestinians, releasing thousands of Palestinian prisoners, and is transferring spheres of power to the Palestinian Authority; while on the other hand, Israel is engaged in a war against terrorism, which has claimed the lives of 75 Israelis since May 1994, when the Palestinian Authority took over Gaza and Jericho.

At least 25 terrorist attacks were carried out by these so-called "prisoners of conscience," not to mention numerous more that were thwarted before they could wreak the havoc intended.

Islamic Fundamentalist organizations, such as Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] and the Islamic Jihad are doing everything in their power to jeopardize the peace process and harm Israel and its citizens, and are recruiting impressionable youth to become suicide bombers.

With regard to Amnesty International's allegations of torture, we would like to reiterate that the Israel

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Government does not condone or encourage torture, under any circumstance. Torture is prohibited both by law and in practice. Every complaint regarding interrogation practices is thoroughly investigated at the Ministry of Justice.

Despite the harsh reality of continuing terrorism, Israel is doing everything in its power to uphold the rights of all persons under its jurisdiction while ensuring the safety of innocent individuals.

Shohat on Need for Ties With Palestinian Economy

TA1105171595 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1505 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Finance Minister Avraham Shohat said today that there is a conflict between the personal security of Israel's residents and the need to support and maintain contacts with the economy of the Palestinian autonomy. The minister accused the donor countries of not meeting their commitments. Our correspondent Yo'av Aviv reports:

[Begin recording] [Aviv] Minister Shohat said it will be very difficult to make progress in the peace negotiations with the Palestinians with the economic situation in the autonomy being so grave. He cannot see how the economic ties between Israel and the autonomous territories can be severed. Severing the ties will cause difficulties and add to the ferment there.

[Shohat] The residents and leadership of the autonomy have created a very high level of expectations believing they will succeed in obtaining large amounts of money, developing their economy, raising the level of living conditions, and bringing prosperity to the residents. To my great regret, just the opposite happened. I believe ties with the Israeli economy are an essential condition for the success of the economy in the autonomy. This, however, creates quite a serious conflict between the Israel's security needs and the need to provide Israelis with personal security, and our ability to allow better accessibility for Palestinians to Israel's economy.

[Aviv] The minister said that Israel must continue seeking solutions, and presented several ideas, some new and some old like the idea of establishing industrial parks along the dividing line. The minister also accused the donor countries of not meeting their commitments, mainly referring to the Arab countries.

[Shohat] The donor countries do not keep their promises, especially not Arab countries such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates that pledged very high sums and do not meet the commitments they made at the Washington conference when the agreement was signed.

[Aviv] Minister Shohat believes that the ties between the Palestinian and Israeli economies will continue with the expansion of the autonomous territories.

As for the Israeli economy, he said the current 6 percent growth is healthy and not as artificial as the growth in 1992 which was the result of government investments. [end recording]

PA Phones Not Disconnected After Intervention

TA1205060195 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 0400 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Bezeq announced yesterday it will not disconnect phone services in Gaza and Jericho. This follows a government decision to absorb 5 million shekels of the Palestinian Authority's [PA] 16-million-shekel debt. The money will be subtracted from the aid that Israel is donating to the authority.

The decision was taken yesterday during a meeting between the army's coordinator in the territories, Major General Oren Shahor, Communications Minister Shulamit Aloni, Bezeq's Managing Director Yitzhaq Kaul, and PA official Jamil al-Tarifi. Al-Tarifi will now bring the agreement to the PA for approval.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Leading Officials Comment on Indefinite NPT Extension

Foreign Minister Welcomes Decision

JN1205105495 Amman Jordan Television Network in English 1000 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Foreign Minister 'Abd-al-Karim al-Kabariti said Jordan has sought a unified Arab position towards extending the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] to ensure a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction.

Commenting on yesterday's UN vote to make the NPT permanent, he said the Kingdom had also called for a universal ban on the spread of nuclear weapons without exceptions. The minister said Jordan welcomed the general principles in the decision, including achieving the globality of the treaty. He said the Kingdom also backed the setting up of global nuclear weapons-free zones, international security guarantees for non-nuclear states, and nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Delegate Urges Israeli Inclusion

JN1205083595 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 0400 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] 'Adnan Abu-'Awdah, Jordanian permanent representative to the United Nations, has stated that Jordan, which was at the forefront of the states that joined and endorsed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT], has always been eager to see the NPT continue to play a significant role in the area of nuclear nonproliferation, and realize its higher goal, which is the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament, in order to create a globe that is completely free of nuclear weapons.

Commenting on the decision to extend the NPT indefinitely, Abu-'Awdah added: Jordan believes that comprehensive, just, and durable peace is incompatible with the continuing existence of the Israeli nuclear installations, which are not subject to the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA]. Hence, and in line with the positive accomplishments achieved by the peace process, Jordan feels that there is a need for Israel to join the NPT and place all its nuclear installations under the IAEA's supervision.

Abu-'Awdah went on to say: As far as Jordan is concerned, the danger posed by the existence of the Israeli nuclear installations, which are not subjected to supervision, is twofold: The threat to regional security and the viability of the peace process, and the safety of the population in Jordan, given the fact that Israeli nuclear installations are close to population centers in Jordan.

Abu-'Awdah indicated that Jordan's decision to endorse the relevant draft resolution reflects its eagerness to see the NPT extended and consolidate the efforts to implement and evaluate it. This also reflects Jordan's desire to see serious efforts to achieve the universality of the NPT and accomplish its higher noble purposes and objectives, which can be summed up in the creation of a world completely free of nuclear weapons.

Abu-'Awdah added: With regard to the draft resolution on the Middle East, my country's delegation supported it regardless of the loopholes and defects it contains. We had hoped that the draft resolution would contain an unequivocal call for Israel to join the NPT and place all its nuclear installations under the IAEA's supervision.

Abu-'Awdah urged Israel to join the NPT without delay in order to nurture the regional peace process, achieve the universality of the NPT, and contribute to the efforts to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons and render the Middle East a region free of nuclear weapons. This, Abu-'Awdah maintained, could promote regional and world peace and help create a globe free of nuclear weapons.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Radio Reports Kidnap of 'Citizen' in South

NC1105192795 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1915 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The Israeli Army has abducted citizen 'Ali Ahmad 'Aliq. AFP quoted Lebanese police sources as saying that the Israelis kidnapped 'Aliq at a checkpoint which they had set up near Arnun 200 meters from the occupied area in the south.

Released After Questioning

TA1205055295 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 0400 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] In south Lebanon yesterday the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] released Hizballah activist 'Ali Ahmad Khalil 'Aliq. 'Aliq, an engineer, was taken yesterday afternoon by the IDF to a buffer area and questioned before being released.

'Aliq returned recently to his village in Lebanon after living in Russia for several years.

IDF Soldier Killed by Friendly Fire in South

TA1105104395 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 1000 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] An Israeli soldier has been killed in southern Lebanon. The story, which has just been released for publication, from Alan Ben-'Ami:

[Ben-'Ami] The soldier has been named as Sergeant Yevgeniy Gubaman, 21, of Qiryat Gat. His family has already been told of his death. According to the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] spokesman, Sgt. Gubaman was in an Israeli Army unit on an operational mission last night in the central sector of the security zone in south Lebanon. The soldiers spotted what was apparently a terrorist band making its way nearby and opened fire. Then they charged towards the band, and it was during that charge that Sgt. Gubaman was killed.

According to the initial Army investigation, a stray bullet from one of his comrades' guns was what shot the sergeant down as the men made their way forward. The terrorists escaped in the darkness. The head of northern command, Major General 'Amiram Levin, has appointed a senior officer to investigate the whole affair, and no doubt further details will be coming out as the investigation proceeds.

Hizballah Welcomes 'Foreign Visitors' in Ba'labakk

NC1105152695 Beirut AL-NAHAR in Arabic 4 May 95 p 16

[FBIS Translated Text] Visitors to Ba'labakk's citadel and archaeological sites and passengers of cars using the road near the citadel's main entrance in front of the Temple of Venus known locally as "al-barbarah" yesterday noticed white placards raised by Hizballah welcoming foreign visitors. The placards contain phrases written in English and in red and black ink. The most prominent placards read: "The message of Hizballah to the whole world: Islam is the solution to all mankind's problems;" "Islam is the religion of mankind, justice, and equality;" and "Hizballah welcomes visitors."

Hizballah's initiative coincided with the visit by French Ambassador Jean-Pierre La Fonda and British Ambassador Maeve Geraldine Forte to Ba'labakk at the invitation of former speaker Husayn al-Husayni, their tour of the city, and their statements that security, stability, and "normal life" prevail in Ba'labakk and all Lebanon.

Local sources have stated that Hizballah's initiative has contributed to a boom in tourism and encouraged foreign visitors to visit the city. Since the beginning of spring, especially in the last two weeks, many tourists have visited the citadel and the archaeological sites.

In another development, personnel of the department in charge of the security of embassies who have a post there have taken new organizational measures inside the citadel. They have removed all peddlers and stalls from the entrance to the citadel to encourage tourism and facilitate the passage of visitors on foot.

A republican decree issued when the late Jubran Tuwayni was education minister bans peddling around the citadel within 100 meters of the walls.

[Two pictures accompany the above report. One picture shows five tourists walking in front of a white placard on which the following phrase is written in English: "Hizbullah... welcomes you with its pioneer values." The other pictures shows a placard on which the following phrase appears in English: "The message of Hizbullah to the whole world: Islam is the resolution of all problems."]

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Statement: Country 'Cannot Agree' to NPT Extension

JN1105210495 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 2015 GMT 11 May 95

["Text" of statement read by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic at the conference of the parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in New York; date not given]

[FBIS Translated Text] The unlimited extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] means that the gaps and the shortcomings which have been acknowledged by most of the parties to the NPT will be tackled — from now on — by relying fully on the good intentions of the nuclear states, which are parties to the NPT, to fulfill their obligations in accordance with the provisions of this treaty. However, regardless of the real reasons which prompted many countries to make the extension decision in this way, a unanimity or semi-unanimity has clearly appeared in the deliberations during the conference, as well as within its committees and the various regional teams, calling for the universality of the treaty with the aim of giving it credibility to accomplish its objectives.

Proceeding from this, Syria believes that the clear failure in achieving the universality of this treaty cannot be accepted. Also, tackling this failure cannot be left for good intentions because this means that nuclear programs and weapons will be left outside the system of nonproliferation and international monitoring, particularly in the Middle East whose security and stability are considered an essential part of world security and peace.

This conference offered a rare historic opportunity in which Israel took no interest to join the treaty and to contribute, along with the region's states, to efforts to turn the Middle East into a zone free of nuclear weapons and various weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, Syria cannot agree to the extension of the treaty unless Israel joins it and agrees to put its nuclear installations under inspection and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Syria, which stresses its concern about the region's security and stability, which was the first state to join the NPT, and which has remained loyal to its obligations under the provisions of the treaty over the past 25 years, cannot approve the exclusion of Israel from this treaty, especially since everybody knows it has a nuclear weapons arsenal, is still occupying important parts of its neighbors' territories, defies the resolutions of the international legitimacy, and behaves as if it were above international law.

Syria's position does not stem from its desire or intention to abandon the goals of this treaty, but from its categorical rejection of the existence of nuclear weapons in Israel. This will threaten security and stability in the region and the world and should be rejected by the international community.

Radio Urges Removal of Israeli Nuclear Weapons

JN1205151195 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1140 GMT 12 May 95

[Station commentary]

[FBIS Translated Text] Gentlemen: Although the international conference in New York extended the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] for an unlimited period of time, it failed to achieve the universality of the treaty, which is a basic guarantee of a planet free of nuclear threats. It ignored Israel, which is considered a nuclear hotbed that persistently refuses to sign the treaty or subject its nuclear installations to inspection, and continues to stockpile weapons and threaten the security and safety of Middle East.

The conference was supposed to honestly and responsibly deal with hotbeds of tension and force all to abide by the policy of nuclear prevention and renounce the policy of double standards in order to establish an international situation in which nobody threatens another — a situation in which peace and security will prevail. However, the big powers' interference prevented the conference from dressing the wound. It failed to make any mention of Israel, even in its final statement. Rather, it ambiguously called on the Middle East countries to join the NPT. If we take into consideration the fact that Israel has been stockpiling nuclear weapons for more than 25 years — while the Arab states, spearheaded by Syria, voiced their commitment to the NPT and were the first to sign it — we can easily realize the great worry prevailing in the Arab region, especially in those countries threatened by Israeli aggression. At the same time, Israel continues to occupy Syrian and Lebanese land, in addition to the occupied Palestinian land. It also carries out acts of aggression on a daily basis against Lebanon and serves up threats smacking of aggression to Syria.

This worry is intensified by the stumbling of the Middle East peace process, by Israel's obstacles and hurdles that prevent the realization of the progress that is sought, and by its explicit refusal to observe Security Council resolutions and the essence of the American initiative on full withdrawal from the occupied lands in exchange for peace.

Arabs in general and Syria in particular were pinning great hopes on an active American and international

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

role vis-a-vis the peace process in order to restore rights, impose the authority of international law, and bind Israel to respect the international legitimacy resolutions. After three and one-half years of painstaking talks, it has become clear that Israel is eschewing the requirements of peace because it fears no international accountability. Israel considers itself to be above the international community and glaringly defies its principles, charters, and resolutions. As it declined to join the NPT, it has persistently rejected and continues to reject all Security Council resolutions; adheres to occupation, expansion, and settlement activity; confiscates Arab land before the eyes of the international community; and exercises a scorched earth policy in southern Lebanon.

If this situation persists, the peace process will become a mere vestige of the past and an indication of the superpowers' failure to impose the sovereignty of international law.

Under circumstances and conditions that gravely jeopardize the security of Syria and the entire Arab region, it is quite natural for Syria to announce its disapproval of an indefinite extension of the NPT and to demand that Israel sign the NPT and open its facilities to international inspection.

It is also natural for Syria, as well as all Arabs, to draw lessons from the current era. One of these lessons is that the policy of double standards still prevails and that Israel is exempt from what is applied to the entire world. Such a policy entails grave consequences, given Israel's expansionist ambitions and aggressive schemes in the Middle East. These dangers are further aggravated by the stumbling of the peace process due to the Israeli obstacles and refusal to respond to the requirements of a just and comprehensive peace.

The Middle East, whose peace is a cornerstone of world peace, will come under further threat if the international community fails to take conclusive action to bring about a just solution that provides security and tranquillity to the Middle East and its peoples. Such a solution requires, first, binding Israel to observe international law, full Israeli withdraw from the occupied Arab territories, and the removal of Israeli nuclear weapons.

U.S. Senate Bill on Jerusalem Called 'Saddening'

JN1105143995 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1130 GMT 11 May 95

[Station commentary]

[FBIS Translated Text] Dear listeners: The leader of the Republican majority in the U.S. Senate has submitted a bill to transfer the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to occupied Jerusalem. Such a bill means recognition of occupied Arab Jerusalem not only as part of Israel, but also as its capital city. Such a bill is saddening for all who care about international law and international legitimacy. This is especially true because the U.S. Congress is the legislative authority of the United States. In accordance with the principle of the separation of powers, the legislative authority enacts and protects laws. Definitely, the U.S. Congress knows that Jerusalem has a world status referred to by the UN resolution in accordance with which Israel appeared as a state. That resolution prevents Israel from taking occupied Jerusalem as its capital. Moreover, the UN resolution issued following the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem in June 1967 denounces and annuls Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem, deeming the Israeli decision and its effects null and void. All of that prevents Israel from taking Jerusalem as its capital. Consequently, it prevents the transfer of embassies to there from Tel Aviv.

Realizing the seriousness of this move by the U.S. Congress, the U.S. Government has made clear references to its negative effects on the peace process. At the same time, Rabin headed to the United States in the wake of the Israeli Government's decision to annex over 50 hectares of Arab territory in occupied Jerusalem, thus breaching Arab rights and the Geneva conventions preventing occupation authorities from carrying out any changes in territory occupied in wartime.

Evidently, those moves, which set the stage for Yitzhaq Rabin's trip to the United States, are not in line with the allegation that the trip is aimed at boosting the peace process. How can Israel carry out measures that strike the peace process in the heart and at the same time say it wants to boost the peace process? If Israel had complied with the terms of reference of the peace process—the UN Security Council resolutions providing for comprehensive Israeli withdrawal to the pre-4 June 1967 lines—from the outset of the peace process, three and one-half years of painstaking efforts to achieve peace would not have been lost. If Israel really wants to advance the peace process, the road is clear. Syria has always made that clear: Full Israeli withdrawal in return for full peace. Facts and events have proved that without ensuring the rights and dignity of all parties, peace cannot be achieved and no real steps can be taken to advance peace.

The Oslo agreement and what has followed it do not indicate that peace can be built by incomplete, secret agreements that do not ensure the return of territory or equitable security. Rabin has talked about new ideas to boost peace. Peace requires both realism and new ideas. This means respect for the demands and needs of all peoples, represented by all parties' right to security, stability, sovereignty on national soil, and not infringing

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

on property ownership. All this has been ensured by the UN resolutions constituting the basis and terms of reference of the Madrid conference. Syria has been calling for a commitment to those resolutions so the peace process will arrive at its target, which is a just, comprehensive peace—the only stable, viable, and durable peace.

Jordanian Request To Name New Envoy Rejected

MM1205092895 London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic 9 May 95 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Syria Refuses To Receive al-Kabariti Or Name New Ambassador to Amman; Tension in Relations Freezes Jordanian Water Projects on al-Yarmuk"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Amman, AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI — The Syrian Government recently rejected a request submitted by the Jordanian Government that Syria name an ambassador in place of the current charge d'affaires in order to enable Jordan to name its ambassador to Damascus.

Informed sources have said that Jordanian Foreign Minister 'Abd-al-Karim al-Kabariti asked his Syrian opposite number, Faruq al-Shar', during their meeting on the sidelines of the nuclear nonproliferation meetings to name a resident Syrian ambassador to Amman in order to enable the Jordanian Foreign Ministry to appoint an ambassador to Syria to succeed the late Ahmad al-'Aqayilah, former Jordanian ambassador to Damascus, who died last year.

The sources added that "al-Shar' rejected al-Kabariti's request, saying that the Syrian Government prefers that the situation remain as it stands at this stage until the features of the Syrian-Israeli track are clear."

Tension arose in Jordanian-Syrian relations after Jordan signed of a peace agreement with Israel. The tension increased after the Syrian leadership received some four months ago a large delegation representing Jordanian opposition parties — which Jordanian circles considered to be Syrian interference in internal affairs, especially as some members of the visiting Jordanian delegation, on their return, made statements that angered the Jordanian Government because they praised Syrian negotiators and made a comparison between them and Jordanian negotiators.

An authoritative Jordanian Foreign Ministry source said in a press statement that the dealings mechanism says that every state is entitled to reject or accept an ambassador when he is named, stressing that an ambassador cannot be appointed over night.

Asked about the possibility of downgrading diplomatic representation between the two countries, the authoritative source said that inter-Arab relations are already not as active or effective as they should be: Our relations with Syria are not cool, nor are they governed by tension.

As is known, Jordanian diplomacy, led by Foreign Minister 'Abd-al-Karim al-Kabariti on direct instructions from the Jordanian monarch, is seeking to clear up Jordanian-Arab relations at this stage in order to grant legitimacy to the implementation schedules of the Jordanian-Israeli agreement.

The sources stressed that al-Kabariti's attempts, in line with this orientation, to storm the Syrian gate have so far failed, although he — that is, al-Kabariti — tried to visit Damascus in a bid to ease the tension between the two countries, but his request was not responded to.

Jordanian officials say that the tense situation between Jordan and Syria is hampering numerous arrangements and projects that are supposed to be implemented in the area, especially those relating to water projects, specifically the dam which Israel and Jordan agreed to set up on the al-Yarmuk river (whose mouth is in Syria), according to the official in charge of the Jordanian water file, Dr. Mudhir Haddadin. Syria is refusing to agree to the Jordanian Government's request to participate in meetings devoted to water projects on the grounds that it has not signed an agreement with the Israelis. Meanwhile Jordanian officials believe that Syrian "intransigence" and the difficult Syrian conditions for peace are exaggerated, because they are obstructing implementation procedures that should be conducted in the area and also affecting Jordanian arrangements. The Syrians stress that they are not concerned with what is happening on the Israeli-Jordanian front, and that they are concerned only with their conditions for making peace — which, according to observers, is causing embarrassment to the Jordanian leadership. Syria is making "concealed" accusations against Jordan of haste and rashness.

It is worth mentioning that German financiers have recently made it conditional that the Syrian Government agree to the establishment of the dam to be built on al-Yarmuk river before they will begin to finance the project. The dam in question is — in the Syrian view — an alternative to the "al-Wahdah [Unity] Dam" which the Syrians and Jordanians had previously agreed to build.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Afghanistan

Rabbani Delivers Speech Marking 'Id al-Adha

LD1005224195 Kabul Radio Afghanistan Network in Dari 1630 GMT 10 May 95

[Speech by President Borhanoddin Rabbani on the occasion of 'Id al-Adha at the al-Fatih mosque in Kabul on 10 May — recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [passage omitted] Dear brothers, as a result of the sacrifices, our nation achieved victory against the aggressors, and the Islamic state has been established. However, our nation faced many problems [words indistinct]. Warmongers and adventurists did not want our Muslim nation to enjoy the fruits of their victory. Destruction was caused, and a large section of Kabul was turned into rubble. Anyway, the past painful experience has been a part of conspiracies hatched outside the country, but the action, of some warmonger elements and groups has been the most dangerous part of this conspiracy. Anyway, now the city of Kabul lives in peace. It is hoped that peace and security will be restored to other parts of the country besides Kabul.

Once again, the Islamic state calls on all groups, individuals, and parties involved in these clashes to make their conscience a judge and pay attention to their responsibilities before our oppressed nation and history, and resort no more to futile adventurism and clashes. They should resolve problems through peaceful means, talks, and understanding with the Islamic state. As we have said, we wanted to resolve the problems through talks and understanding.

Right now, the Islamic state has established contacts with all involved sides through all kind of means. We arranged to meet them, and have asked different sides that we should no longer allow the fighting to continue in our country. Let us peacefully resolve our national problems through understanding. I hope that these meetings will lead to peace and security in our country. We continue our efforts. We try to convince by all possible means to resolve the problems through understanding. It depends on them how many of those people will devote themselves to the cause of peace and how many will allow themselves to be in the service of the foreigners' conspiracies as they did in the past. But we are hopeful that the adversaries will cease hostilities, and will resolve problems through understanding.

Dear brothers, we have said that we will support any peace effort, whether national or international — it is to be said, in connection with the efforts of the United Nations, that we resolutely support the efforts of Mr. Mestiri, special envoy of the UN. However, the reason for the failure of Mr. Mestiri's efforts was not due to lack of cooperation from the Islamic state but was due to bad planning and lack of cooperation from the other sides — this led to the failure of Mr. Mestiri's efforts. Now we once again positively and seriously respond to any efforts whether by the United Nations — by Mr Mestiri — or by any country which wants peace and security in Afghanistan, and we will support them.

It should be mentioned that if the Islamic state takes steps for administrative reforms and the consolidation of security [pauses].... Dear brothers, another point that should be mentioned is that the Islamic state, as ever, clearly announces that we have never wanted to prolong our rule by force and duress. We have always been of the opinion that the people of Afghanistan should directly determine their political system and elect their national leadership. It should be said here about the peace efforts of Mr. Mestiri that the matter on which the state differed with Mr. Mestiri was, to say it briefly, that Mr. Mestiri in his recent efforts wrote to the same centers of power. He wrote a letter to the north [Dostam], a letter to the Taleban and to other sides, and told them that so and so group could appoint representatives for five provinces, and another group could appoint representatives for ten provinces. In this connection we, the Islamic state, expressed our view in these words: Instead of power centers being asked to appoint representatives, it would be better for a supervisory commission composed of the Afghans and (? the UN representatives) to go to all provinces and ask the people of every province — the elders, the Ulema, commanders and the intellectuals — to elect their representatives. Instead of the state or the power centers influencing the appointment of the representatives, the people themselves should elect their representatives. If a person, who the state would not want to be appointed, is elected by the people, he shall be accepted by all of us. And if a person is elected by the people in the areas which are controlled by other armed powers but not acceptable to them, we shall accept him. This was the only matter on which we differed with the United Nations. I am of the opinion that this proposal reflected the best form of democracy. Apart from this, we had no differences. We said we would render any kind of cooperation. The state's only demand was that instead of armed powers which wanted to control the provinces by force, the United Nations-appointed supervisory delegations should go to the provinces and appoint the representatives. [sentence as heard]

I was taken aback by Mr. Mestiri's reaction to my proposals which I believed completely complied with the views of the Western countries. His reaction was completely unnatural, and against the UN principles.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Anyway, we will leave this for the United Nations to make a judgement about. Once again we put emphasis on the fact that in order for the power transfer to take place, the representatives of the people shall be appointed in some possible manner, and they should make a decision about the leadership and all other issues of the country. And we completely support this. We hope that the United Nations or any other source, which will be making efforts for the restoration of peace, shall not ignore those points.

Dear brothers, another point which should not be forgotten is that our country has been ruined. And we face many problems in most of our cities. We shall not ignore this point regarding the reconstruction of our country. We started the uprising against the Red Army aggression on our own. Many people might be thinking that Afghans were mad because they were fighting the communists with their bare hands. But by the grace of God we achieved victory in our great jihad. Eventually we noticed that the great powers started following us and supported our jihad whether or not they wanted to. Now for the reconstruction of our country, once again our nation should take the initiative. We should not wait for a Marshall Plan to be introduced in Afghanistan by the great powers as it was implemented in Europe. Relying on our faith, determination and the strong will of our heroic nation, we shall embark on the reconstruction. I am confident that our nation is capable of reconstructing its country. [passage omitted]

***Background on Taleban, Zones of Influence Viewed**

95AF0054A Paris LE MONDE in French 20 Feb 95 p 2

[FBIS Translated Text] The "Taleban" have suddenly become players in the Afghan equation. At the local level, they have been on the scene since the beginning of the war: But their recent rise to prominence is explained by a change of strategy on the part of Pakistani authorities, who remain tireless in their efforts to control any regime that may be installed in Kabul.

The Taleban are young students, natives of southern Afghanistan. Members of the Durrani and Ghilzai Pashtun confederations, they were educated in the religious schools ("madrasa") scattered along the border with Pakistan. Traditionally, in Afghanistan—even before the war—students of theology and Islamic law began their schooling in private madrasas, the majority of which were located in rural areas and run by a clerical family; in many cases, such families had ties, at least nominally, to religious brotherhoods. Students would complete their schooling in Pakistan, first in the Pashtun zone, later—at least for the brighter ones—in Lahore and Karachi.

So the Afghan madrasas were connected to specific religious networks, and sided with them in their quarrels. Fundamentalist networks, in the sense that they all favor enforcement of Islamic law (shari'ah) and mandatory wearing of the veil for women. The "traditionalists" observe the most orthodox version of Sufism, rejecting the cult of "saints." Hanafi Sunni, they most often have ties with the so-called "deobandie" school represented in Pakistan by the Jam'iyat-e Ulama Eslami party of Mawlana Fazl Rahman. The most influential clerical group in Afghanistan, they are the mainstay of the "Taleban." The "Wahhabis," by contrast, condemn tradition, all mystical tendencies, and any division into religious schools or divergent juridical codes.

During the war, these clerical groups were eclipsed by the Islamist parties, which under the influence of the Arabic Muslim Brotherhood preached a radical and politicized Islam; they recruited among the ranks of lay students at the national university—people like Hekmatyar and Mas'ud, both former engineering students. But the madrasas in the south were also active against the Communists: They turned themselves into "fortified convents," serving simultaneously as military bases and religious schools. In a highly tribalized milieu, they provided places where students from different clans and tribes could live together. As has often been the case in Afghanistan, these religious structures offered a way around tribal conflicts, at least temporarily.

Ethnic Conflicts

Thus the "Taleban" were established in remote, mountainous areas where they harassed government outposts down in the plains. Poorly equipped and receiving little support from the Pakistanis, who had allied themselves with Hekmatyar, they marked time and struggled to prevent the rest of the resistance from crumbling in the wake of the Soviet withdrawal.

After the mujahidin recaptured Kabul in April 1992, the internal conflicts became purely ethnic in nature: the Tajiks with Mas'ud versus the Uzbeks with Dostam versus the Shiite Hazaras and the Hezb-e Eslami [Islamic Party] of Hekmatyar, who recruited mainly in Pashtun areas. The Pakistanis, through their army's secret service (ISI) [Inter-services Intelligence], threw all their weight behind the Hezb-e leader, playing the Pashtun and fundamentalist card.

But Hekmatyar was far from being the undisputed leader of the Pashtun population: Rejected both by clerical leaders and by the tribal aristocracy, he recruited among detribalized Afghans, so his base of popular support was very narrow. But party discipline and Pakistani aid enabled him to prevent any accord in Kabul, which his men bombed regularly.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Islamabad's Aims

Political impasse and popular weariness alone probably would not have been enough to change the status quo, had not an "establishment" Pakistani party decided to change horses. Previously, Afghan policy was set by the ISI and by the Islamic party Jam'iyat-e Eslami [Islamic Society], two of the pillars on which the regime of the late General Zia had relied.

Circles close to Benazir Bhutto, the current prime minister, wanted to limit the role of the ISI and become players themselves in the Afghan game. General Babar, the interior minister, hoped to open a direct road between Pakistan and Central Asia through Afghanistan. The continued fighting in Kabul made that impossible.

So the ISI-Jam'iyat axis was replaced by an alliance between the Interior Ministry and Jam'iyat-Ulema-Islami, the clerical party that had opposed General Zia. The Taleban began receiving money, heavy weapons, and armor from their new protectors. It is likely that Saudi Arabia, miffed at Hekmatyar for his support of Saddam Husayn during the Gulf war, followed the movement's activities closely. The small [word missing] parties that the Saudis supported were making no political headway, and the religious strictness of the Taleban could not help but make a favorable impression on them, even though the Taleban came from a different religious tradition.

The Pakistani turnabout is less "strategic" than it seems. The Pakistanis are still playing the Pashtun and fundamentalist card in Afghanistan. While the Taleban may be "above" tribal divisions, they are still, above all, Pashtuns. And they have doubtless won support among the Pashtuns, many of whom rejected Hekmatyar but deplored the fact that Kabul remained in the hands of the Tajiks and Shiites.

It is thus no surprise that the Taleban managed to capture the mantle of Durrani and Ghilzay tribal leadership in just a few short weeks. Today, standing up to the northerners—the Tajiks, Shiites, and Uzbeks—they reject the alliance with Uzbek leader Dostam that had allowed Hekmatyar to keep Mas'ud pinned down. They consider that the latter's political pragmatism—he put former Communists back in office and has shown himself very liberal on the question of women in the job market—is incompatible with the strictness they preach.

It is thus probable, once again, that an essentially ethnic antagonism will be reinterpreted in terms of "good" versus "bad" Islam. Recent events indicate that the Muslim world is sliding from revolutionary Islamism toward a puritanical fundamentalism that has no real political agenda.

Movements Described

The Sunni "fundamentalists" include:

- The Hebz-e Eslami of Golboddin Hekmatyar. Radical Islamist, until recently it was supported by Pakistan;
- The Jam'iyat-e Eslami of Borhanoddin Rabbani. Moderate Islamist, it counts in its ranks prestigious General Mas'ud, hero of the war against the Soviets. He leads the so-called "government" camp that holds central Kabul and the Tajik zones.

The "traditionalists" include:

- The Jabha of Sibghatullah Mojaddedi. Its leader is the representative of an important Pashtun family. "Royalist," it does not have a wide base.
- The Mahaz-e Eslami of Pir Sayed Ahamad Gailani. "Royalist," it is a very conservative formation, supported financially by Saudi Arabia.
- The Ettehad-e Eslami [Islamic Union] of 'Abdol Rasul Sayyaf. This coalition of small formations is described as "Wahhabite" due to its ties with Riyadh, which backs it financially.

The Shiites:

- The Wahdat (Unity) party. Supported by Iran, this coalition of small Shiite parties has solid support among Afghan Hazaras.

India

Further Reportage, Commentary on Clashes in Kashmir

Army: 'No Civilian Casualty'

BK1205092795 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0830 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The prime minister has announced central assistance of 15 crore rupees for building the houses and shops around Charar Sharif which have been destroyed in fire caused by militants. The details for the disbursement of assistance to the people who have suffered losses are being worked out. The prime minister this morning took a meeting of Council of Ministers on Jammu and Kashmir and reviewed the situation arising out of the Charar Sharif [incident].

The prime minister, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, is meeting the leaders of political parties in New Delhi this afternoon. The meeting will assess the situation arising out of the destruction of the Charar Sharif shrine in Srinagar by foreign mercenaries yesterday. The government will apprise the political parties of the

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

action taken to deal with the situation. The home minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan, and the parliamentary affairs minister, Mr. V.C. Shukla, will attend the meeting.

The prime minister has condemned the barbarous act by terrorists and foreign mercenaries and appealed to the people of the state and elsewhere to remain peaceful and defeat the nefarious designs behind the heinous crime.

In Kashmir Valley, there has been no civilian casualty in Charar Sharif town in the continuing encounter between the security forces and the foreign militants. This was disclosed by a senior Army spokesman to newsmen in Srinagar today. Giving details about the operation, the corps commander, Lieutenant General J.S. Dhillon, said that 23 militants have been killed, including seven foreign mercenaries, in the encounter. He expressed the hope that the rest of the militants will be nabbed by this evening. Mr. Dhillon also said that the Army used only ordinary weapons during the encounter and no mortars or artillery were used. The curfew continues in the 10 towns of the valley as a precautionary measure with no untoward incident reported. Large number of Improvised Explosive Devices [IED] blew up on their own. He also said 14 IED have been unearthed and defused.

The civil aviation and tourism minister, Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad, visited Charar Sharif town today to assess the situation. He told our correspondent that he will discuss with the governor measures to tackle the situation. Mr. Azad also visited some places in Srinagar city and exchanged ideas with some prominent leaders.

Latest reports say that people in Srinagar are offering their Friday [12 May] prayers in mosques and the situation in the valley is peaceful.

Islamabad Condemns Army 'Siege'

BK1105032995 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in English 0300 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] In occupied Kashmir, the Indian troops stormed the holy shrine of Sheikh Nuruddin Wali in Charar Sharif early this morning, desecrating and destroying the 18th century Muslim mystic tomb. During the encounter, over 35 Kashmiri Muslims were martyred. The entire occupied Kashmir has been brought under curfew with immediate effect to forestall a massive uprising against the Indian action.

The occupation forces set on fire the shrine and the nearby locality. The khanqah [convent] and mosque adjacent to the shrine were also set on fire. Fighting is still continuing between the freedom fighters and the Indian troops and communications from the town have been broken.

It may be recalled that the leaders of the All Parties Hurriyat Conference, including Mir Waiz Omar Farooq, had declared to march toward the Charar Sharif dargah [shrine] tomorrow, breaking the continued siege by the Indian troops. Massive demonstrations were held yesterday in Srinagar against the siege. A number of prominent Kashmiri leaders were arrested during the demonstrations, who were later released due to mounting pressure.

The Indian troops have also claimed to have martyred seven freedom fighters in other incidents in the held valley. They have also claimed to have arrested many others. These incidents mainly occurred in Badgam, Baramula, and Kupwara.

Meanwhile, the Communist Party of India-Marxist has stated that the current situation in Jammu and Kashmir was not conducive for holding assembly elections. The party's general secretary, Mr. Harkishen Singh Surjeet, told reporters in Agartala that an explosive situation was prevailing in Jammu and Kashmir. He alleged that the government was trying to hold the elections in the territory under pressure from the United States, but his party will participate in the elections if the people of Kashmir were involved in the process.

Pakistan Warned on 'Interference'

BK1205074295 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0035 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The minister of state for home, Mr. Rajesh Pilot, has warned Pakistan against interfering in India's internal affairs, saying this could lead to serious consequences.

Reacting to the burning down of the holy Charar Sharif shrine by foreign mercenaries, the minister said that Pakistan had once again proved its devilish interference in the internal affairs of India. Mr. Pilot said Parliament in one voice resolved that the only unfinished task in India-Pakistan partition is the vacation of Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. If Pakistan does not stop interfering in the internal affairs of India, it shall have no option but to accomplish this unfinished task, Mr. Pilot warned.

Commentary Blames Pakistan

BK1205120895 Delhi All India Radio General Overseas Service in English 1010 GMT 12 May 95

[Commentary by Samual Bate]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The destruction by fire of the Charar Sharif Shrine on 'Id al-Adha has plunged the Indian people into a state of shocked grief. No amount of words can correctly reflect this state, especially to

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

those who are unaware of the fact that this 600-year-old shrine symbolized India's composite culture that has developed over the centuries. This shrine was visited and venerated by both Muslims and Hindus.

There is another important fact that should help in understanding the tragedy of the destruction of the shrine; that is, not all Muslims consider visits to dargahs [tomb of a saint] or shrines as something Islamic. Among them is Jammat-i-Islami. Militant groups who have their roots in the ideology of this party not only do not believe in visiting dargahs and shrines, but consider it an un- Islamic act. Among such groups is Hizbul Mojahedin, which has been in the lead of militancy in Kashmir. But it is possible that local Kashmiri supporters of the Hizbul Mojahedin keep up their faith in the sanctity of shrines. But this cannot be said of those militants who have come to Kahsmir from Pakistan and Afghanistan. Their aversion to shrines is part of their religious ideology.

There could be two reasons why the remote controlled militants chose to burn down the shrine.

One, as Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao and other leaders have said, this destruction is meant to create a situation where it becomes more impossible for India to restore democracy and normalcy in Kashmir through elections. Pakistan considers this normalcy as its defeat. Its leaders — like Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, who heads the Kashmiri Committee of Pakistan parliament — say that if the present militancy fizzles out there will be no militancy for the next 100 years in Kashmir. Pakistan is willing to see a stop to this militancy only if the territory of Kashmir comes to it.

The second reason: The militants entered Charar Sharif not to leave it without destroying it. They therefore rejected government's offer of safe passage to Pakistan. It is not correct that they were holed up. They were on a mission in the shrine and were kept briefed on transmitter from across the border on what they should or should not do. Even while a severe shoot out was on between them and the security personnel, Harkutal Ansar in Pakistan had a bullet-to-bullet account. It announced that two of its men have died. They also had communications with the All Parties Hurriyat Conference office in Srinagar as reported by a foreign radio. But why destroy Charar Sharif? That is a moot question.

You have already heard this shrine symbolized the composite Hindu-Muslim culture. Pakistan wanted to destroy it for all what it stood for. Pakistanis have not forgotten that the people of Kashmir had rejected Muslim League's two-nation theory because that did not go with the sufi [plain and simple] character of the Kashmiris. Pakistanis also remember that because of this rejection of the two-nation theory, the Kashmiris sided with India in 1947-48 and in 1965 when Pakistan tried to grab Kahsmir by force. It will be interesting to note that even in occupied Kahsmir, this theory remains unaccepted till today. The Muslim League of Pakistan has not been able to establish itself in that occupied territory.

It is quite clear that one major objective of Pakistan in Kashmir is to destroy the Kashmiri character of religious tolerance and peace and the sufi way of Kashmiri thinking. It is, therefore, no wonder that Pakistani agents first attacked non-Muslims in the valley to create a communal rift. As a result, thousands of Kashmiri non-Muslims had to flee their houses and live with refugees in other parts of India. Yet Pakistan has not been able to create the tide of communal frenzy in Kashmir that would accept the two-nation theory. That speaks for the character of the Kashmiris.

As told earlier, Government of India's plan to hold elections in Kashmir is a greatest threat to Pakistani designs. Apparently, instructions to destroy Charar Sharif came when it became very clear that elections will be held before 18 July. Here we have to remember one important fact; that the Afghan war has given four powerful weapons to Pakistan — funds, arms, trained mercenaries, and the art of false propaganda. It is using all these gifts to grab Kashmir.

Editorial Laments 'Dastardly Action'

BK1205023495 Delhi THE PIONEER in English 11 May 95 p 8

[Editorial: "Crisis in Charar Sharif"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The arson at Charar Sharif in which at least 600 houses and shops have been gutted can not but cause concern. But it is important, especially for residents of the town and the people of the Kashmir Valley, not to be provoked by this dastardly action of the armed mercenaries who have been holed up in the shrine of Sheikh Nuruddin for the past many weeks. It will also serve everybody well to bear in mind that despite the adverse situation created by the terrorists, the security forces who have been on vigil around the town were able to ensure that the fire did not cause any damage to the shrine. Indeed, the role played by the para-military and Army jawans in Charar Sharif is a measure of their self-restraint and discipline. It is obvious that Monday [8 May] night's arson by the terrorists was aimed at provoking the security forces into taking precipitate action and thus raise a storm both within and outside the State.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Had the terrorists who have defiled the shrine been successful in their endeavour, it would have severely affected the Government's plans to hold election in the State. The backlash would have put paid to all such efforts, not to mention the adverse comments it would have fetched from those countries which have been providing support to the separatist movement. In a sense, Monday's incident can be used by the Government to push home the fact that if shrine is in danger, as is being claimed, then it is because of the terrorists and not the security forces. For the past nine weeks now the authorities have been appealing to the mercenaries to leave the shrine; that they have been offered safe passage underscores the Government's commitment towards protecting the place of worship. If the terrorists are indeed concerned about the shrine's safety, they would have accepted this offer.

But protecting the shrine is the least of their concerns — those who have defiled it are working to a plan designed to help Islamabad's campaign on Kashmir. It has been established beyond dispute and despite claims to the contrary that Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence [ISI] is in constant touch with the terrorists holed up inside the shrine. The ISI has been directing them with the help of high frequency wireless sets. There is also evidence to believe that as many as 70 heavily armed terrorists, including Pakistani and Afghan mercenaries, have taken shelter inside the shrine. They belong to Harkat-ul Ansar and Hizbul Mujahideen which are directly aided, funded and armed by Islamabad and their leader, Mast Gul, is a known ISI operative. Hopefully, the people of Kashmir will not be swayed by their propaganda and leaders like Mr Shabir Shah and Mr Yasin Malik will exercise restraint at this point of time and call off Friday's protest march. What is at stake is a holy shrine of India which is being held hostage by a group of malcontents who have no regard for human lives, least of all for the religious sentiments of the people of the Valley. On its part, the Government must continue to be cautious while dealing with this problem.

Minister Denies Sri Lanka Seeking Military Aid

BK0705154495 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0830 GMT 7 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The external affairs minister, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, has said that India wants peace initiatives by the Sri Lankan Government to succeed and normalcy restored in the island nation. He said that Sri Lanka has not sought India's military support to deal with the LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam] in the wake of the latest offensive.

In an interview to PTI [PRESS TRUST OF INDIA], Mr. Mukherjee said the resumption of dialogue with Pakistan stalled since January last will depend on Islamabad's response to the renewed offer of talks without preconditons made by the prime minister recently. He said it is not possible to give a timeframe for the talks, but hoped that they will resume at some point of time.

On the reported U.S. Administration's efforts to make a one-time waiver of the Pressler amendment to facilitate the delivery of F-16 fighter planes to Pakistan, Mr. Mukherjee cautioned against the move, which will force India to step up its defense expenditure.

Iran

Further on Sanctions, Strained U.S. Relations

Libya's Al-Qadhdhafi Pledges Support

LD1105144895 Tehran IRNA in English 1407 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Tehran, May 11, IRNA — Libyan leader Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi on Thursday [11 May] pledged support of Libyan people and Government for the Iranian nation and Government in the wake of the recent U.S. economic sanctions against Iran.

In a telephone conversation with President Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the Libyan leader also felicitated Rafsanjani on the occasion of the 'Id al-Adha and wished prosperity and success for the Iranian nation.

Al-Qadhdhafi described political independence, economic development plans, resistance and high level of consiousness of the Iranian people as the most effective factors in foiling the hostile policies of world arrogance against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

President Rafsanjani in return congradulated the Libyan leader and praised resistance of the Libyan people and Government against bullying of arrogant powers.

The Iranian president also expressed appreciation for Libyan support for the Islamic Republic of Iran in confronting the recent U.S. threats. He assured the Libyan leader that the Islamic Republic of Iran is too powerful to be affected by economic sanctions of America.

Citizens Boycott U.S. Products

LD1205080795 Tehran IRNA in English 0631 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Tehran, May 12, IRNA — The Channel One of the Iranian Television suddenly cut an American-made film half way through Thursday night

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

following numerous phone calls from viewers protesting the screening of American movies.

Officials of the Channel One of the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB) had to stop broadcasting the rest of the film "Runner" [as received] after receiving strong complaints from viewers.

Many Iranian people who watched the film contacted various sections of IRIB and the Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) Thursday night and Friday morning, strongly criticizing the broadcast of American made films.

Over the past week, the Iranian people angered by U.S. President Bill Clinton's decision to impose economic sanctions on Iran have boycotted American made commodities in protest at Washington's hostile attitudes towards the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Rally Condemns 'U.S. Plots'

LD1205085995 Tehran IRNA in English 0839 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Orumieh, West Azarbaijan Province, May 11 [date as received], IRNA — Iranian teachers and students during their rallies in the different provincial cities today condemned the U.S. plots in imposing economic boycott on Iran.

Calling ineffective the U.S. recent plots, the teachers and their students expressed their support for the strong stances of the leader of the Islamic revolution and the earlier statements released by the Iranian officials concerning campaign against the arrogant world.

Also chanting "Death to the U.S., death to Israel," the demonstrators once again displayed the Iranian unflinching resolve in campaign against the U.S. plots.

At the end of the political rally a statement was released in which the teachers and their students called on all the Muslim countries to boycott American products in their countries as well as to listen to the decrees issued by the leader of the Islamic revolution concerning the economic order and economizing on the use of commodities.

Teachers and students of different schools of the cities of Miyandoab, Piranshahr, Maku, Bukan, Khoey and Naqadeh participated in the rallies which took place in their cities.

Daily Assails 'Hostile' U.S. Policy

NC0405201795 Tehran JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI in Persian 1 May 95 pp 1, 9

[Editorial: "Washington Contemplating a Change of Tactics"]

[FBIS Translated Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful.

One hundred U.S. experts and politicians participated in a session under the topic of the "Conference on Iran's Strategic Importance" in Washington. While criticizing the erroneous policies of the White House, they warned Clinton of continuing his hostile policy against Islamic Iran and suggested that the United States should find a way to improve relations with Iran.

The participants at this session are recognized U.S. figures, some of whom are foreign policy experts, including Gary Sick the National Security Council adviser, and Richard Murphy, the former Assistant Secretary of State. All concurred in the key role and geopolitical location of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The general emphasis at this session was how Iran has not only retained but also enhanced its strategic importance and decisive role in the aftermath of the Cold War. Today, Iran is considered a serious element in the political balances of the region which cannot be ignored or eliminated.

The essence of the remarks by the speakers at this conference was reminiscent of the popular Western rhetoric which is used as a political tactic [preceding word in English] at times — that is, "if you can't beat them, join them." None of the speakers mentioned the need for a basic review of U.S. policies toward Iran that could be more realistic and purported to compensate for the U.S. murky foreign policy of the past. Not one of them mentioned that the U.S. dossier is black in the eyes of the Iranian people and the United States has no recourse but to accept the Islamic Revolution and try to comprehend its objective and tangible realities. The main focus of the discussions were based on the idea that the current White House policies are not yielding results in isolating or intimidating Iran in this manner.

It was also explained at this session that the propagandist-commercial U.S. pressures against the United States against Iran are ineffective and should be considered erroneous. Naturally, if Washington wishes to continue such a policy, not only will the United States be deprived of the Iranian market and economy, the rival European countries will home in to take their place. In the long term, Washington will become isolated and alone in its policy of combating Iran and there is evidence of this already. Washington's efforts

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

to elicit a favorable response from its European allies fin adopting a similar policy with regard to Iran have encountered complete defeat.

The main point that was documented at this session was that Tehran is able to resist the fallout of the U.S. oil and commercial embargo by adopting reliable measures. The implementation of such a policy by the United States could, at the most, cause some hardship to Iran for a month or two, which would be temporary. Iran would be able to revert to its normal commercial and economic position very quickly.

The gist of the discussions at the session was that the U.S. current hostile policy with regard to Iran is ineffective and the most serious recommendation by the U.S. experts to the Clinton government was that it is necessary that the United States take steps to improve relations with Iran.

What inferences can be drawn from these viewpoints aired by the U.S. experts? The most immediate and serious result was that the U.S. academics criticized the Clinton administration for adopting an incorrect policy and the main nucleus of the criticism by the experts was why did Washington not adopt a clear and categorical policy which could be "effective." Let us not forget that the session had been convened under pressure from the U.S. companies and was funded by them. The main source of worry was that the Clinton administration has taken action that has totally ignored the interests of the U.S. companies in economic, commercial, and industrial relations with Iran.

The fact is that the economic situation in the United States is due to a weak and shaky dollar, and consecutive socio-economic crises at home, especially the moves and efforts by U.S. commercial competitors to fill in the position vacated by the U.S. companies on the international economic scene. This has left no room for political, economic, and propagandist maneuvering by the Clinton administration.

Not much time had elapsed since Clinton's annulment of the Conoco deal when this session was convened in Washington. No one in the United States applauded this facile move or shouted 'hurrah' [preceding word in English] but in Iran serious, firm, and compensatory decisions were adopted against Washington's policy immediately. President Hashemi-Rafsanjani promptly issued a meaningful statement warning the United States that it would terminate the existing economic relations any moment it deemed fit.

In conjunction with these remarks a group of experts reviewed the possibility at various levels, of a preemptive move against the United States. The most momentous consideration was that a replacement be selected for continuing work on the project which Conoco had reneged on following Clinton's directive. This was done swiftly and categorically and it was proved to Washington that it does not have the upper hand as far as dealings with Iran are concerned.

If until yesterday, facts and figures indicated that Clinton's policy with regard to Iran had ended in failure, today his explicit defeat is clearly evident. Thus, all the proposals propounded for the amelioration of relations with Tehran can be assessed against this perspective that the U.S. policies of yesterday have encountered defeat.

If this mode of reasoning and this tactical approach by the U.S. intelligentsia is viewed against the backdrop of the U.S. black dossier with regard to the Iranian nation, it proves once again that the United States cannot be trusted. This cannot be considered a proposal for a change of strategy with regard to Iran but an effort to merely change tactics, implying that if the manifestation of hostility and a direct inimical stance is not possible, this policy should be pursued by means of direct talks. Naturally Iran's answer to such suggestions would still be in the negative.

Daily: Country Will 'Resist' Pressure

NC0405113295 Tehran TEHRAN TIMES in English 26 Apr 95 p 2

[Editorial: "Uncle Sam, Iran Will Never Cry Uncle!"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] According to the latest reports, the United States is planning to put more pressure on the Islamic Republic of Iran for what it alleges is "Iran's sponsorship of international terrorism."

The Middle East Economic Survey has published a report which indicates that Bill Clinton's administration is in the final stages of reviewing an Executive Order which would prohibit U.S. oil companies or their overseas affiliates from purchasing, refining or trading in Iranian oil anywhere in the world.

Now that Washington has been rebuffed both by Beijing and Moscow in its attempts to prevent them from cooperating with Iran in nuclear fields, it may be up to a new mischief to compensate for the international humiliation caused by Russia's and China's rejections.

It seems that the U.S. officials are slow learners in that they have not yet learned the lessons they should have learned when they imposed an eight-year war against the valiant nation of Iran, a nation that proved to the world that single-handedly it can fight against the Western world and their regional henchmen who took their orders from Washington.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

The very nation that fought valiantly for eight years to safeguard its honor and territorial integrity, will resist any attempt by the U.S. or any other country to make Iran capitulate to foreign powers.

The Islamic Revolution began with the brave and lonely protest of the late Imam Khomeyni to Shah's capitulation to the Americans in 1963. When true Muslims were not in power in Iran, they still had enough gumption to stop a corrupt king in his track. Now that they are in power, they will surely resist any pressure to capitulate.

The U.S. officials have been led to believe that they have the monopoly on everything. They are under the illusion that by not buying the Iranian oil they are going to make a dent in Iran's oil revenue. They are dead wrong.

This illusion on the part of the U.S. is yet another example of the U.S. bottomless arrogance. It is such an arrogance that has made the U.S. notorious among most Muslims as Global Arrogance. The world does not revolve around the U.S. interest, nor does it really care about U.S. irrational demands. The preposterous logic of the U.S. officials in accusing Iran of backing international terrorism is what makes their demand fall on deaf ears. The U.S. government needs to invite all their experts on persuasion tactics to devise a cogent strategy against Iran, one that the world will buy. So far, whatever claim the U.S. government has been suitable only for internal consumption, and a lame, ineffectual one at that.

As for what Iran will do if the Executive Order comes about and takes effect: There are other wiser western powers ready to readily fill in the gap in the oil trade created by the U.S. withdrawal. Iran for its part would continue to resist buckling under U.S. pressure.

So in a language American officials well understand, Iran would like to cry out: "Hey Uncle Sam, Iran Will Never Cry Uncle."

Views on Russian Relations, Nuclear Cooperation

Envoy on 'Commitment,' Regional Issues

NC1105163095 Tehran TEHRAN TIMES in English 9 May 95 pp 1, 14

["Exclusive" interview with Kamal Kharrazi, permanent representative to the UN, by unidentified TEHRAN TIMES correspondent in Tehran; date not given]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Tehran — Iran's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Dr. Kamal Kharrazi, yesterday said the credibility of Russian President Boris Yeltsin is at stake in the Middle East.

In an exclusive interview with the TEHRAN TIMES, Kharrazi said that countries in the region are carefully eyeing Yeltsin's moves, 'whether he will succumb to U.S. President Bill Clinton's demands or fulfill his country's commitment to Iran.'

Dr. Kharrazi expressed optimism that Russia will 'honor' its commitment of building a nuclear power plant for the Islamic Republic which is intended for peaceful purposes.

In the last few weeks, so much pressure has been mounted by Washington on Moscow to abandon the agreement signed with Iran in 1989. The nuclear power plant issue will be an important part of the agenda of both presidents when they meet tomorrow.

So far, Kharrazi said, Russia has made it known that it will resist the pressure, saying he hopes Clinton will be met with toughness.

Kharrazi, a soft-spoken diplomat, said that the current anti-Iran wave in the United States is nothing but part of campaign gimmicks to win selected candidates in the coming presidential elections slated for next year.

"You see," Kharrazi said, "Both republicans and democrats are eyeing the White House and for this reason they have pinned all their hopes on the Jewish community of the United States."

The anti-Iran move is just to please Israel and the Zionist population in America in order to assure success in the forthcoming presidential election, Kharrazi told the TEHRAN TIMES.

Kharrazai was a guest of honor at a lunch hosted by the daily's Managing Director, Hojjat ol-Eslam Seyyed Morteza Saheb-Fosul.

A senior diplomat, Kharrazi said, "Don't forget that 70 percent of Clinton's election expenses for president were paid by the Zionist-oriented Jewish community."

He said ordinary Americans have no political awareness and most of them really do not understand the policies pursued by their government.

"But," he said, "What's well known is that the majority of Americans oppose the administration in Washington."

United States officials consider the interest of Israel more important than that of their own nation, he said.

American officials have worked tirelessly to present a distorted picture of the Islamic Republic in order to make regional Arab countries afraid of Iran, he added.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

American interests in the region are purely monetary, their aim being to sell weapons and buy crude at prices they want, Kharrazi said.

Asked to comment on the Zionist state, he said that "Israel is a genuine threat in the region and the main reason for Muslim opposition to this illegal entity."

"Peace is not possible as long as Muslim lands are occupied by the Zionists," Kharrazi maintained.

Commenting on the proposed indefinite extension of the nuclear Non—Proliferation Treaty (NPT), he said, "Iran supports one of the groups which believes that the NPT should be extended subject to the condition that there be a built-in mechanism which will ensure a review of the commitments made by the five major nuclear powers."

"This mechanism should be able to eradicate deadly weapons from the globe forever," the diplomat said.

Egypt's stance on the NPT was correct and Israel's refusal to sign will make it a potential danger to the entire region, he added.

On the European Union's stance towards Iran in the light of Clinton's call for an all-out trade ban on Iran, Kharrazi said, "The EU will not listen to the United States as it has a big interest in trade with Iran."

On apostate Salman Rushdie, Kharrazi said, "Iran has not sent and will not send commandos to kill him.

"The 1989 fatwa issued by the Founder of the Islamic Republic cannot be revoked and will stand forever."

Interview With Atomic Energy Head

NC1105070595 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0305 GMT 11 May 95

[Studio Interview with Reza Amrollahi, vice president and head of the Atomic Energy Organization, by unidentified radio announcers; from the daily "My Homeland" feature — live]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Male announcer] We said we would have an extremely dear guest in the studio on "My Homeland." His Excellency Reza Amrollahi, esteemed vice president and head of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization, is with us now. Your Excellency, good morning and welcome.

[Amrollahi] Good morning to you and to all the dear listeners. I will seize this opportunity to again congratulate everyone on 'Id al-Adha yesterday. I would also like to extend my congratulations ahead of 'Id-e Qadir-e Khom, a high point in Shiite culture and thought.

[Male announcer] Thank you.

[Female announcer] Today there is talk about the United States and its plots. One of the major rumors the United States is spreading is that, despite what it says, Iran intends to use nuclear energy for military purposes. What is your opinion on this and how do you assess this issue?

[Amrollahi] Of course there is nothing new in U.S. allegations against us. But I think that in everything an allegation should be viewed from a particular angle. Over 10 times so far the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] and its experts, as well as countries even slightly involved with us, have said that this is not so. But because of its pertinacity, the United States repeats what it says each day and each moment.

On my way here I saw a report. I would like to mention it here. I believe—if I am not wrong—that one person who worked in the IAEA for some time, a man named Rosen, who, according to this report, is the U.S. assistant secretary of energy, answered Clinton's allegations by saying....

[Male announcer, interrupting] What is the source of this report?

[Amrollahi] This report comes from New York and was published yesterday. I will read the report exactly. It says: A former U.S. official has stated that U.S. opposition to the construction of nuclear reactors in Iran does not conform in any way with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT].

And this is so. In the NPT's Article Four we see that those countries with an ability to make peaceful use of nuclear energy can cooperate. Well, we now clearly see that the United States is inflicting pressure and making truly inopportune remarks, accusing us—for example—of wanting centrifuge. Anyone who knows about these things knows there can be no centrifuge in the nuclear power plant agreement. And I am sure that all the U.S. officials, or at least U.S. experts, must know this. I am surprised they raise this point.

In our agreement, we made no mention of centrifuge, and have never sought this. I think this is nothing but truly childish hostility started by the United States.

[Male announcer] In relation with this, Russian Foreign Ministry Spokesman (Grigoriy Karasliy) said in an interview with REUTERS that...

[Female announcer, interrupting] Yes, he stated that the IAEA did not disagree with the sale of Russia's nuclear technology to Iran, that Russia did not surrender to Washington, and that it will sell a nuclear reactor to Iran. He added that there is no indication that Iran intends to

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

acquire nuclear weapons, and that, even if this is so, our nuclear reactor will not be used for this purpose.

[Male announcer] Also, (Pyotr Pernyak), the vice chairman of Russia's Security and Defense Committee, said that nuclear reactors are industrial equipment and pose no military threat. These were only meant to complement your remarks.

[Amrollahi] Thank you very much. If you will allow me, I would like to state something else.

[Female announcer] Please go ahead.

[Amrollahi] There are 420 nuclear reactors in the world today. Why should a country like the Islamic Republic of Iran not have a nuclear reactor for energy production and for peaceful purposes? If the United States truly says that only some countries have this right, then why the double standards?

I would like to recall something very interesting. I am sure that many experts must remember this. When Sullivan came to Iran, he went back to Carter and asked what type of cooperation there could be between Iran and the United States. Carter said the two could cooperate in every field. He asked about the nuclear industry, to which a green light was given. Sullivan then came back and informed the shah. These things are all written down. The shah was very happy. But my question is: Carter and Clinton are both from the same faction. Why the double standards? Was the United States of 20 years ago different from the United States of today? Generally speaking, it is said that U.S. foreign policy has not changed much and that the general points remain the same. Then why the double standards? The Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant was being built then. When it concerned the shah there was no problem in setting up 20 nuclear power plants, so how come even one is a problem when it comes to us? All these are questions to which they have no answers.

[Male announcer] We thank you very much for your comments. We are with you on "My Homeland." [passage omitted]

[Female announcer] As we said, one U.S. Department of Energy official said that Russia's nuclear technology is precisely of the same type Washington intends to place at North Korea's disposal.

[Male announcer] And of course we should add that this reactor produces only energy and everyone knows that Iran has granted the IAEA inspectors the permission to inspect its nuclear centers. Well, please tell the dear listeners about this.

[Amrollahi] As you stated, our power plant in Bushehr, which we want to complete, is exactly the same type as they want to build for North Korea now.

I would like to state that between 70-80 percent of the mechanical work and as much, maybe more, of the construction work at the Bushehr Power Plant, the first unit of which we want to complete, has been finished. Our investment, depending on the rate at which it is calculated, is between $10-$12 billion; with under $800 million more this power plant can produce electricity. It is logical for our country to complete this plant as soon as possible so that we do not waste the investment and so that we can end the energy shortage in the country, giving us a reliable source of energy for at least 30 years, the lifespan of a power plant, and making the most of our investment.

I would like to say something about the inspection to which you refer. Some regulations govern the construction of a nuclear power plant in a country that is a member of the NPT. Naturally we added our signature to those regulations. IAEA inspectors come here at regular intervals for inspection purposes. So all the commotion by the United States is worth nothing from the technical point of view.

Their own technical experts have repeatedly said this. If you recall, last week the U.S. secretary of energy—in the United States atomic energy is known as energy—aware of the technical points of the issue, spoke in ambiguous terms. Since he knows the technical aspects of the issue, he could not disagree and he indirectly revised or rejected some of the comments by Clinton.

All these show that this is nothing but commotion. And I think that all these games and the commotion have been started because Israel does not want to sign the NPT. This has all been started so that Israel's moves are not seen and so that Israel does not grab all the limelight now that the pact is to be renewed.

[Male announcer] We thank you very much for your comments Mr. Amrollahi.

Russia Said Committed to Cooperation

LD1205104995 Tehran IRNA in English 0849 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Moscow, May 12, IRNA — The Russian atomic energy minister announced Friday [12 May] that Moscow would fully respect all its obligations regarding Iran's peaceful use of nuclear energy.

He added that Russian President Boris Yeltsin laid special emphasis on the implementation of agreements

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

reached between Iran and Russia for peaceful use of nuclear energy.

There is no vague points about the implemenation of Bushehr project or the delivery of training reactors as well as training of Iranian experts, he reiterated.

Meanwhile, the procedures of implementing the Iran-Russia Contract for completion of Bushehr nuclear reactor in southern Iran were discussed in a meeting here Thursday between the Russian atomic energy minister and Iranian ambassador in Moscow Mehdi Safari, here Thursday.

Daily Views U.S.-Russian 'Rift'

LD1105082595 Tehran IRNA in English 0726 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Tehran, May 11, IRNA — The English-language daily TEHRAN TIMES here Thursday [11 May] editorialized on the much talked about summit between the U.S. President Bill Clinton and his Russian counterpart Boris Yeltsin and said it failed to achieve all that Americans had hoped for.

As a reason for such a failure, the daily pointed to Russia's refusal to unilaterally cancel agreements which it has signed with Iran.

Referring to the agreement between the U.S. and Russia to evaluate the sale of nuclear reactors to Iran in a joint commission, it wrote "even though the establishment of the joint commission is meant to whitewash the stark differences in positions held by both U.S. and Russia, the deep disagreement between the two countries need to be viewed as an eternal bone of contention between them."

To explain the rift between Moscow and Washington, the editorial referred to the "appeasement or non-appeasement of the Zionist regime. Whereas U.S. President has had to appease the Jewish voters in order to be elected, the Russian president is not concerned about how the Jews will think of him in his country or how his relations with the Zionist regime might be affected. When Bill Clinton returns home, he will probably tell his Jewish voters that he did his best to put Iran's nuclear program high on the agenda and will ask them not to forget him in the 1966 elections. As opposed to Clinton who has to lower himself in such humiliating barter of appeasement for Jewish voters, Yeltsin does not have a powerful Jewish lobby in his country to worry about."

"What really widens the rift between the U.S. and Russia is that Moscow, as the seat of the Soviet empire, which has had extensive relations with the Arabs and Iranians, understands and to a great extent sympathise with them. Against the backdrop of such motivations and such opposing interests, it does not seem likely that Yeltsin would ever adopt a position that may only suit an American president. Besides, Yeltsin and other officials in Moscow fully realize that if they give an inch to the U.S., the Americans might ask for a foot, and there goes Russia's dignity and self-respect," the daily added.

It further noted, "For Russia to be known in the world as a country that honors its agreements, it has no choice but to go ahead with the agreements with Iran as planned. If Russians renege on their promise, they will come to be known as a fickle state unable to go through agreements signed with other sovereign states."

However, TEHRAN TIMES concluded, "it is the frightening prospect of the loss of good reputation at the international level, and its deleterious effects on all of Russia's foreign trade at the international level, that has so far held Russia back, and will hold back in future, from wavering in its nuclear agreements with Iran."

NPT Official Views Communique, U.S. Pressure

NC1205054895 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0330 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] After almost two weeks of discussion the conference on revising and renewing the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] ended last night with a final communique. Our correspondent in Paris reports on the outcome of the conference.

[Begin unidentified correspondent recording] The final communique of the conference, approved with the efforts of the delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran and several Nonaligned countries, highlighted the NPT members' full access to the necessary technology and technical know-how for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This was approved as one of the paragraphs of the final communique.

Despite opposition from the U.S. delegation, the communique recognized the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] as the sole legal body that can supervise and inspect the nuclear activities of the NPT members. Despite Washington's extensive efforts for the unlimited and unconditional extension of the Treaty, the NPT members propounded conditions for signing the NPT.

Sirus Naseri, leading our country's delegation to the conference, in an exclusive interview with the Voice and Vision of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Paris an hour ago, said that despite heavy pressure by the United States and NPT members, and thanks to the extensive efforts of the Islamic Republic's delegation, important paragraphs, such as the right for the peaceful use of

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

nuclear energy for all the NPT members, as well as recognition of the IAEA as the sole body that can state a view on the nuclear activities of the NPT members, were included and approved in the final communique. The NPT members also officially protested the Zionist regime's disagreement over signing the pact.

This is the Voice and Vision of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Paris. [end recording]

Hajj Supervisor Meets Hezbollah Members

LD0705084195 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0330 GMT 7 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] A group of people comprising members of the Lebanese revolutionary movement of Hezbollah and Palestinian revolutionary Muslims met and conferred with Hojjat ol-Eslam val Moslemin Reyshahri, who is the representative of the Vali-ye Faqih [representative of the Supreme Jurisconsult, Khamene'i's representative], and the head of the Iranian hajj pilgrims, in holy Mecca yesterday.

According to a Voice and Vision correspondent in Mecca, the representative of the Vali-ye Faqih referred to the resistance and valuable jihad of Lebanese and Palestinian Muslims against the Zionist army, and said: Victory in the Greater Jihad [Hajj-e Akbar] and the fight against one's desires help open the way for overcoming enemies and are the secret of success for all who struggle in the path of Islam.

The report says a meeting was held at the honorable leader's office [Khamene'i's office in Mecca] last night during which issues relating to Palestinian and Lebanese Muslims and the Islamic jihad were reviewed. A group of scholars, spiritual leaders, members of the Islamic resistance from Lebanon and Palestine, and a number of political and religious personalities from the Islamic Republic of Iran participated in the meeting.

During the meeting, Ayatollah Ahmad Jannati, a clerical member of the Guardian Council, and a number of Lebanese and Palestinian scholars spoke about the characteristics of the Islamic movement in occupied territories.

Mr. Reyshahri also met a group of pilgrims from Afghanistan, Brazil, Paraguay, Belgium, France, Kenya, and Australia yesterday, explaining the achievements of the hajj pilgrimage for pilgrims to the Holy House of God and explaining U.S. conspiracies against Muslims.

Article Views Self-Administration of Hospitals

95LA0212A Tehran SALAM in Persian 12 Mar 95 p 2

[FBIS Translated Text] **The Day's Glance**

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

What Will Be the Cost of the Self-Administration of Hospitals?

As we read and heard in the recent news, according to the 1374 [21 March 1995-20 March 1996] Budget Bill, the current funds of the treatment section have decreased, and government hospitals will be privately run from the beginning of next year.

Even though this policy is in keeping with privatization and the continuation of the gradual elimination of subsidies, its disharmony with the creation and expansion of the general health insurance network will cause heavy and irreparable side effects for the society, especially the deprived and the vulnerable strata.

In the issue of privately run hospitals, general health insurance was supposed to be a supportive tool to prevent the likely pressures on society, whereas in practice the self-administration of hospitals before general insurance can actually help the needy will have negative effects.

Given the high cost of health care and the experience of countries that lack the necessary support for the sick in society, usually not all patients can afford proper care. This problem is more serious and worrisome regarding infectious and classic diseases because they carry the virus of the disease and can, by themselves, infect a large number of people who also lack financial means.

The notion that conservation in health costs will decrease government expenditures is a simplistic one. Undoubtedly, the economic and social side effects of various diseases and the harm to the health and safety of the society will far exceed the achieved savings.

The policy of eliminating the budget of the hospitals, on the other hand, is contrary to the essential policy of the Ministry of Health, which emphasizes "health" and prevention of diseases, because releasing the sick, who cannot afford the high cost of treatment services, will in fact mean nothing but the spread of diseases.

Truly, the officials of the Ministry of Health have won the competition over all their predecessors. Of course you know the problem of medicine was eliminated some time ago with the establishment of the single prescription centers with prices several times the prices of the open market and a total disregard for the generic drug plan. Now, the problem of treatment in the country will be solved with the establishment of privately run hospitals. What remains is medical education, and it is not clear what they have in mind for it.

Article 29 of the Constitution makes explicit: "Providing social security and the need for health and treatment services and medical care in the form of insurance, etc., is a general right. The government is responsible, in accordance with the law, for providing these services and financial support for every individual in the country from the general revenues and revenues resulting from the people."

Obviously, the Constitution clearly obliges the government to provide services and financial support for health and treatment for every member of society. Hence, the question must be asked: How and by what justification has that bill been devised and ratified?

Apparently, the general health insurance bill is the most important justification used in this connection. Insurance, which is supposed to be implemented in five years, at the present (that is, about the start of private operation of hospitals) is only a word. What kind of help can it be in reducing the side effects of stopping health services subsidies?

Another question is: How does the decrease in the share of treatment in the country in the gross national product conform to the goals of development? Is it not true that in the course of development this share has to increase? Then, what is the meaning of the decrease?

Another point is that the private operation of hospitals is less regulated. In other words, every hospital will spend according to what it wastes, and the expenditures cannot be controlled because due to lack of initial investment and providing resources, competition between the private hospitals is not an issue. Second, the government hospitals are distinct, and even their centralization will not include them in competition among themselves due to the differences in the kinds of services they generally offer.

In the meantime, every problem will be directly on the shoulders of the patients, patients who will ignore their illnesses merely because of the cost of treatment.

Pakistan

Bhutto Condemns 'Barbaric' Indian Act in Kashmir

BK1205025695 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in Urdu 0200 GMT 12 May 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has condemned the desecration and destruction of the shrine of Hazrat Sheikh Nuruddin Nurani and the adjacent mosque by the Indian forces in Charar Sharif.

In a statement issued in Islamabad yesterday, she said the desecration of the shrine and the mosque has sent a wave of indignation and sorrow among all Pakistanis. She said this premeditated and barbaric act of sacrilege once more shows how low the Indian troops can stoop to keep our Kashmiri brethren under their subjugation

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

forever. The prime minister said this latest act of savagery is aimed at purging the Kashmiris' faith in and their feelings toward holy places, so as to undermine their courage and determination.

However, as events in the valley over the past five years have clearly demonstrated, such Indian attempts will never succeed. Benazir Bhutto said the heroic and courageous struggle and the indomitable spirit of the Kashmiris cannot be crushed through such repressive actions. She said the movement for freedom has pervaded the body and soul of the Kashmiri freedom fighters who are determined to continue their struggle unless and until they achieve their right to self-determination. The prime minister said we pray for the martyrs who have sacrificed their lives for freedom.

Leghari Interviewed on Kashmir, Regional Issues

BK0905014695 Delhi INDIA TODAY in English 15 May 95 pp 66-69

["Excerpts" of an interview with President Farooq Ahmad Leghari by INDIA TODAY Senior Editor Shekar Gupta in Islamabad; date not given; first paragraph is INDIA TODAY introduction]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] *By the current standards of Pakistani politics, Sardar Farooq Ahmad Leghari could indeed be described as a wise old man. At 55, the President of Pakistan packs a lot more experience in political craft than Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto or her arch-rival Mian Nawaz Sharif. By Indian standards, however, he could be considered rather young for such a high of high office. [sentence as published] Particularly as in India, the President's office is largely ceremonial and a sinecure for a party loyalist at the end of his political career. But the presidency in Pakistan is far from titular, with the late General Zia's Eighth Amendment of the Constitution arming the President with sweeping powers, ranging from dismissal of elected governments and legislatures in at the Centre and in the states to the appointment of service chiefs. Having been dismissed by a President using these powers earlier, it was vital for Benazir to choose one she could trust. Leghari, in some ways, was a natural choice. A scion of the hereditary chieftains of the Baluch-Leghari tribe, and a graduate of St Catherine's College at Oxford, Leghari played polo and tennis, was an Oxford Blue and represented Pakistan twice in pistol-shooting events at the Asian Games. He gave up the civil service of Pakistan (CSP, equivalent to the IAS [Indian Administrative Service]) to join the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto in 1973. Since then, he has been one of the most consistent PPP leaders and has held several federal portfolios, including finance and foreign affairs. Given his experience, stature and Punjabi background (Legharis, though a Baluch tribe, are settled in Punjab's Dera Ghazi Khan district), he was a natural choice for the presidency. Leghari has, however, tried to play down his PPP connection and bring in an element of bipartisanship to his office. There was some disappointment in New Delhi when it became apparent that Leghari would represent Pakistan at the SAARC [South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation] summit instead of Benazir. But given Pakistan's unusual constitutional arrangement, and his own position, Leghari carries on as President, though not quite with the same visibility as his prime minister. In a two-hour interview, his first to a foreign journalist since he took over as President, Leghari spoke to Senior Editor Shekhar Gupta in Islamabad. Excerpts:*

Q. What are you expecting from your visit to India?

A. As you know, SAARC excludes formal bilateral discussions. But, informally, there will be an opportunity to meet and get to know Indian leaders personally. It is important to get to know people personally.

Q. Isn't it sad that though we are neighbours, there is so little contact between our leaders? In fact, it is your first visit to India ever.

A. It is unfortunate. But it is a consequence of the tension between us over Kashmir. It is an old problem going back to Partition. The level of tension has gone up or down at times, depending on the conditions in Kashmir. But we consider this the core issue.

Q. Is the tension worse than ever now?

A. It has never been very good. But given the brutalisation now, the presence of more than half a million troops which represent the largest ratio of troops to people in any freedom struggle in the world, it upsets people not only here but internationally. There is the question of the UN resolution which has to be implemented. And there is the unfinished agenda of Partition. Kashmir is the only item that remains to be settled there. If you look at all that, the situation today is pretty bad.

Q. You keep talking about the UN resolutions all the time. Why is there no mention of the Simla agreement? Is that irrelevant now?

A. Pakistan has never said no to the Simla agreement. It does provide a vehicle for dialogue. But the Simla agreement does not exclude UN resolutions or any other route to a settlement on Kashmir.

Q. Do you really think that wasn't the understanding when the late Bhutto signed the Simla agreement?

A. No. We don't think so. And we do not agree with what Mr Dhar (P.N. Dhar, former aide of Mrs Gandhi)

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

has recently written about it (implying Bhutto accepted the Line of Control as the de facto border).

Q. Then how come no Pakistani leaders raised the UN resolutions for more than a decade after Simla?

A. It was mentioned. It is an item on the UN agenda. It was never removed. But naturally when the people of Kashmir rose against India because it was not fulfilling its promise, and when military forces were inducted in such a big way, the matter acquired greater relevance.

Q. But isn't the tension level in Kashmir lower than last year?

A. No. There is the siege of Charar-i-Sharif. Last year, the number of troops was half a million (5 lakh). Now, there are more than 0.6 million (6 lakh). New units of the Rashtriya Rifles are being raised and sent into new areas. The Indian troop strength has increased in geometric proportions. There is no need for such high troop levels. **Q. There must be some mythology in Pakistan about Indian troop strength. No international agency or think-tank puts the total Indian Army strength at 1.2 million. Is it possible that half of it would be in the Kashmir Valley?**

A. There is no exaggeration here. There is not just the army but also the paramilitary forces. We know it from authoritative sources that the figure is correct. **Q. I think somebody has got his arithmetic wrong.**

A. You might feel that way. But we also have access to certain information which is correct from our perception. I agree that intelligence agencies sometimes tend to report incorrectly. But we are very sure of this. **Q. How do you react to India's efforts to hold elections in the Valley?**

A. I don't know how anyone can even talk about elections with such high troop levels, no legal rights and TADA [Terrorism and Disruptive Activities Act] in force. Last time, only 3 per cent people voted. Now the situation is a lot worse. All Kashmiri parties including the Hurriyat have ruled out elections. And leaders like Farooq Abdullah, who is close to the Indian Government have expressed scepticism. If the Indians force an election, it would only create further difficulties.

Q. None of us says that the human rights situation in Kashmiris ideal. But TADA exists all over India. And if top Kashmiri leaders can visit even the Pakistan High Commission, hold press conferences in Delhi, meet people, something has changed. Why don't you acknowledge that?

A. But you didn't let them meet your honoured guest, Mr Rafsanjani. Only Farooq Abdullah was allowed to meet him. There has been a lot of pressure on India internationally and also from human rights activists and the media within your own country. Therefore, we see some cosmetic changes — the Mirwaiz was allowed to go to Casablanca. Some Kashmiri leaders have gone for Haj but the ground realities are still alarming. Think of the gains one million people could have made if this core issue were solved.

Q. Then why not move into less intractable areas like trade, people-to-people contact and confidence building? Why hold everything hostage to Kashmir?

A. There have been seven rounds of foreign secretary-level talks since 1990 which yielded nothing. What is the point of going on talking for form's sake? This is the historical legacy of the past 50 years. We believe the issue cannot be skirted any more. Possibly, my presence at SAARC could present an opportunity for high-level contact. I don't know if the opportunity would come now, but if it does, we could talk about it.

Q. Why are you so sceptical?

A. I am neither sceptical nor optimistic. I know Mr Rao is a very wise leader. He has been on the Indian and international scene for a long time. He has the vision to understand the issues, all these things. But we are also aware of the problems India faces when it is entering an election year. There have been some results which haven't been favourable to the Government. But we hope an issue like this is bipartisan and will not depend on the party in power.

Q. There is a feeling in India that Pakistan is stalling as an instrument of policy. Look at the agreement on non-attack on nuclear installations. It could be held up to the whole world as an example of CBMs (confidence-building measures) between estranged neighbours. Why not more of that?

A. We are not stalling as an instrument of policy. We want to improve relations with India. But we feel this undue emphasis on CBMs is not going to help. Just beating about the bush as a matter of policy doesn't help. It hurts our relationship. We feel a time has come when we all have to sit down and see how this issue has hurt our vital interests, whether it is access to Central Asia, joint projects, trade, even gas pipelines.

Q. How do you react to Rafsanjani's proposal for a gas pipeline to India through Pakistan?

A. We are all for it. We have told our Iranian friends that if they have a problem in arranging independent funding, we are willing to even help with the World Bank. Or, we could arrange private- sector financing. There is a proposal from Qatar for a pipeline to Pakistan. We have told Iran that they could plug into it and this

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

pipeline could go into India, particularly western India, which is your industrial heartland. You will benefit enormously and Pakistan would be happy to facilitate it. The same applies to Turkmenistan's proposal to export gas through Pakistan. The scope is enormous.

Q. And does this also have to wait for Kashmir to be resolved, or can this happen anyway?

A. We are willing to go ahead with it. The regional concept of gas distribution evokes great confidence in the private sector.

Q. To come back to Kashmir, there is a view in India that Pakistan forfeited claims to move resolutions because it took recourse to war in 1965.

A. That way I could say there are many in India who are not reconciled to the existence of Pakistan. It is these forces who were responsible for military intervention in East Pakistan.

Q. So it's a bloodfeud that must continue?

A. I personally feel we have reached a stage where we must look at the future which looks very bright. Wherever it exists, let us get out of this (blood feud) syndrome. Kashmir is the last remaining item on the agenda of Partition. There was a certain context to Partition. Settle it and there won't be any more problem between us.

Q. Do you entirely disagree with the Indian view that Pakistan is helping militancy in Kashmir? The international media has said so, even President Clinton has talked about aid coming in through privatised sources.

A. Our support is political, diplomatic and moral. But during the Afghan jehad, there was a lot of international effort by Arab countries and others. Volunteers came from Indian-held Kashmir to fight in the Afghan jehad as well. They now very well have the know how and ways of resisting brutal military regimes. So maybe that element is there. But India blames Pakistan's ISI [Inter Service Intelligence] for all its problems, from the North-east to the south, from the west to the central region. Sometimes when I read all this, I feel very proud that our ISI is even better than America's CIA. But humour apart, tell me, how can someone penetrate the Line of Control (LOC) in Kashmir? We do not send any aid by air. The LOC iS heavily patrolled not by a ragtag army but by your army, which is one of the finest armies in the world. We only provide food and succour to refugees at our camps that are open to inspection.

There could, however, be some trickle from the jehadi groups in Afghanistan.

Q. Isn't this jehad element a problem for you as well?

A. Yes, it is. Our border with Afghanistan is extremely porous. It is six times more than the LOC in Kashmir. Crossing by tribals is a matter of routine and tradition. The proliferation of weapons and drugs has caused us very serious problems. It is very difficult to control.

Q. Particularly when it gets mixed up with fundamentalism.

A. In Pakistan, we do not use the term fundamentalism. There may be certain extremist groups motivated by religion or crime. This is a result of the Afghan war and certain policies of the dictatorial regime of Zia. Free availability of arms becomes a force multiplier for these groups.

Q. Is Pakistan paying the price for the West's victory in the Afghan war?

A. Yes. There is a degree of callousness on the part of the West. The Afghan cause was just. But the western powers have gone away without unwinding what they started. The result is the Kalashnikov culture.

Q. What could they have done?

A. There should have been a plan to disarm the region. If the West had its act as focused on unwinding as on fighting, there could have been peace by now. The West and all the other players have been immoral, too, in leaving it all like this. A centralised plan to buy back weapons left over from the Afghan War, if properly planned and executed, would have helped. It would have helped the cause of stability in the region.

Q. Are you concerned about India's improving relations with Pakistan's three closest friends — China, Iran and Afghanistan?

A. Let me just say we have the fullest confidence in our three closest friends.

Q. How do you look upon your role as President, given the special powers under the Eighth Amendment?

A. I am sworn over the Constitution as it exists. My own personal views are, however, different. I believe that certain parts of the Constitution need to be amended to bring in parliamentary democracy in its truest sense.

Q. Are you talking about the Eighth Amendment? That means you are talking about diminishing your own role and powers.

A. Yes, when I took over, I tried to bring both the Opposition and the ruling party together in the hope that

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

we will be able to carry out the necessary amendments. Unfortunately, it did not work because of the highly polarised and personalised nature of our politics. There are also people who believe that certain powers, like the appointment of service chiefs, are good for the preservation of the system in Pakistan. My personal view, however, is that some of the powers (of the President) must be reduced.

Q. You became President at 54. Where do you go from here?

A. Well, let's see. Where do you go from here? In public life, usually presidency means the end of the road. I only wish some of the non-issue-based polarisation in our politics would go down.

Sri Lanka

President: Ready To Confront Any Situation

BK1105125395 Colombo Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation International Service in English 1045 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] President Chandrika Kumaratunga has said that the government is ready to face any situation confronting the country. Necessary action has been taken to strengthen the Armed Forces, establish peace, and to safeguard the rights of minorities.

She made this statement in response to an inquiry by the Mahasangha [Buddhist clergy] at the Buddhist Advisory Council meeting held at Temple Trees [official residence of prime minister]. She reiterated that though every effort was made to resolve the ethnic issue by peaceful means, the LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam] was not prepared to do so. Although the government stood for peace, it did not in any way undermine the morale of the armed forces. The president said when they assumed office the Army did not have the necessary armaments. A fund will be set up to aid Dhamma [religious] schools. (?Samana) areas will be given a special place to obtain preliminary education. An awareness program will be prepared for Bhikkus [Buddhist monks] to improve relations between the village and the temple. Two committees were appointed at the meeting to popularize the teachings of the Dhamma [Buddhist religion] among the public.

Military Launches Attack; Pursues 'Terrorists'

BK1105120695 Colombo Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation International Service in English 1045 GMT 11 May 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The Sri Lankan Air Force has begun an anti-LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam] offensive with successful strikes in a series of enemy camps in the Paramban area, south of Elephant Pass in the north. Military Spokesman Brigadier Sarath Munasinghe said yesterday that these air strikes destroyed all LTTE bunkers which had been located through prior reconnaissance and the pilots confirmed that the strikes have hit the target. The troops at Elephant Pass army camp had seen these raids. He said that the Air Force at present is launching a massive attack on terrorist targets, south of the Pooneryn army camp. The Air Force is using fighter jets for these sorties. A series of similar air strikes has been planned for the next few days, according to security sources.

Meanwhile, troops pursuing a group of terrorists who attacked a route clearing patrol engaged them off Periyakarachchi. According to sources in the east, 10 Tigers were killed in the (?ambush). The troops also found bodies of several terrorists, some of them badly mutilated in the battle field. Army monitoring radio communications between the (?field) terrorists and Tiger area leaders have put the death toll of the terrorists at 10. Troops had counted 25 Tigers in the group they engaged. They were clad in camouflaged uniforms and wearing helmets.

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 352
MERRIFIELD, VA.

This is a U.S. Government publication produced by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

FBIS collects, translates, disseminates, and analyzes foreign open-source information on behalf of the U.S. Government. Its publications may contain copyrighted material. ***Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.***

— Bracketed indicators before the first sentence of each item describe the way in which the material was processed by FBIS.

— Headlines and all bracketed explanatory notes are supplied by FBIS.

— Personal and place names are rendered in accordance with the decisions of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names as adapted by FBIS. Unverified names in radio and television material appear in parentheses and are spelled phonetically; words and phrases in parentheses preceded by a question mark are unclear in the original and deduced from context.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

U.S. Government Customers

For a list of FBIS products, to subscribe to an FBIS publication, or to indicate a change of address contact:

FBIS
P.O. Box 2604
Washington, DC 20013-2604
Telephone: (202) 338-6735
FAX: (703) 733-6042

Non-Government Customers

Subscriptions are available from the National Technical Information Service:

NTIS
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
Telephone: (703) 487-4630
FAX: (703) 321-8547

New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.